THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

CONFINED CHILDREN: A Descriptive Survey of Children Contained in Alberta "Compulsory Care" Facilities

BY

(C) JOHN H. TAYLOR

A THESIS

Submitted to the Faculty of Graduate Studies
and Research in Partial Fulfillment of the
Requirements for the Degree of
Master of Education in Counseling Psychology

Department of Educational Psychology

Edmonton, Alberta

Fall, 1982

micro

THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

RELEASE FORM

NAME OF AUTHOR John H. Taylor

TITLE OF THESIS CONFINED CHILDREN: A Descriptive Survey of Children Contained in 'Compulsory Care' in Alberta.

DEGREE FOR WHICH THESIS WAS PRESENTED M. Ed.

YEAR THIS DEGREE GRANTED 1982

Permission is hereby granted to THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA LIBRARY to reproduce single copies of this thesis and to lend or sell such copies for private, or scholarly or scientific research purposes only.

The author reserves other publication rights, and neither the thesis nor extensive extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without the author's written permission.

(Signed) .....

PERMANENT ADDRESS:

R.R. #2
CARVEL, ALBERTA
TOE 2CO

DATED Oct 15 1982

THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES AND RESEARCH

The undersigned certify that they have read, and recommend to the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research, for acceptance, a thesis entitled CONFINED CHILDREN: A DESCRIPTIVE SURVEY OF CHILDREN IN ALBERTA "COMPULSORY CARE" FACILITIES, submitted by John Taylor in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the Degree of Master of Education.

J G Paterson
Supervisor

W Hague

E. W. Tamke

Oct/82
Date

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this descriptive survey was to determine how a recent piece of Child Welfare legislation in the Province of Alberta was being used. The legislation was an amendment to the Provincial Child Welfare Act which gave an extraordinary authority to judges and the Director of Child Welfare, to confine highly disturbed or delinquent children. It was felt that by describing in detail all those children who were confined under this legislation, on a specific date, February 11, 1982, conclusions would be available relevant to the utilization of the legislation.

Children were described by means of a questionnaire which tapped biographical, demographic and family information, academic grade level scores, I.Q. scores and scores on an attitudinal assessment, the Jesness Inventory.

Results indicated that, in the author's opinion, a proportion of the children confined under this legislation, may not be the "hard-core" delinquent or highly disturbed children for whom the legislation was intended. These children may be those who have been placed in compulsory care settings directly from their homes, although more information about them is necessary. Non-delinquent children scored as high or higher on the Jesness Inventory as did the delinquent children. Implications of these data for further research are discussed.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

I would like to thank those members of my committee who so thoroughly read this thesis and offerred their critiques and encouragement - Drs. W. Hague and E. Gauk. I especially thank Dr. John Paterson for his consistent support throughout the length of this project.

Many Child Care Workers throughout the Province, teachers and secretaries in child care settings, provided much needed assistance with the data forms.

I owe an especial amount of thanks to Joanne Loughlin, the Co-ordinator of the Alberta Institutional Information System, for her help and support, and to Pat Van Berkel for her clerical and editorial assistance.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER		PAGE
I	Introduction	1
	Purpose	3
	Method and Procedure	4
	Definitions	5
	Limitations of the Study	9
	Organization of the Thesis	11
II	Some Historical Highlights of the Care of Children Apart from Their Families	12
	Child Care in Alberta	15
	Summary	25
	Description of Compulsory Care Facilities	26
	Previous Research Involving Descriptive Instruments: WISC-R	28
	Jesness Inventory	30
III	General Description of Method	35
	Subjects	35
	Procedure	36
	The Questionnaire	37
	Field Training	38
	Administering the Jesness Inventory	39
	Grade Level	39

CHAPTER		PAGE
	Intellectual Assessment (WISC-R)	39
	Rationale for the Selection of the Descriptive Instruments	40
IV	Results	42
	Child Characteristics	42
	Region Making Referral	43
	Placement History	43
	Family Characteristics	45
	Family Size	46
	Income	47
	Government Involvement with Other Children in Family	47
	Adoption	48
	Delinquent History	48
	Length of Time Since First Contact with Alberta Social Services	49
	Orders vs. Certificates	50
	Medical Factors	52
	School Achievement and Behavior	53
	WISC-R Scores	54
V	Summary and Conclusions	56
	References	61
	Appendix A TABLES	67
	Appendix B Compulsory Care Forms	97

CHAPTER PAGE

Appendix C Variable List 100

Appendix D Questionnaire Manual 103

Appendix E Jesness Inventory and Description of Sub-scales 150

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

> Our current perspective on delinquency is similar to that of a drunk who wakes up to find himself in the gutter. Placing one hand on the sidewalk, he mutters to himself, "By golly, I'm going to climb over this wall if it takes me all night".
> (Hackler, 1978, p.93)

For a variety of reasons, some children will always be cared for by adults other than their parents. In the past, this care has taken many forms, from orphanages, poor houses, approved schools, to training schools, foster homes, group homes and treatment centres. The Province of Alberta has experimented with a variety of types of care, which have been seen as solutions to a variety of problems.

Most recently, on October 1, 1976, an amendment to the Alberta Child Welfare Act came into effect, which profoundly changed both the care and the procedures by which disturbed and delinquent children in this province come into care. This amendment, called the Compulsory Care Amendment, empowered juvenile court judges to independently and directly confine in a locked setting for a period up to 90 days, any child who was considered a danger to himself or the community. Previously, all such power of confinement was under the control of social workers employed by the Alberta Department of Social Services and Community Health, and was used only after all other attempts to treat the child had apparently failed.

There are several rationales of the Compulsory Care Amendment. In Social Services; Child Welfare Programs it is stated:

> Compulsory Care is that component of residential services which provides secure care for a select minority of children who present a danger to themselves or others and are suffering from an emotional or behavioral disturbance. Designated compulsory care settings are designed for intenstive assessment or short term treatment over a specified time period, not for long term treatment. This is not intended as a punitive, retributive measure, but is intended for those children who engage in a pattern of persistent, uncontrollable behavior which less secure settings have been unable to control or treat (p. 171).

It has also been stated (Russell, 1982) that prior to the Compulsory Care Amendment, children were being confined with a legal authority that had not yet been tested in court, and were it tested, may not have been upheld. The Compulsory Care Amendment was to provide that proper legal mandate with which to confine children.

In addition, during the period prior to the Amendment, there was a great deal of concern on the part of the Calgary and Edmonton Police Departments about a group of approximately 150 'hard core' delinquents (Alberta, 1976, p. 69) who were not being dealt with, with sufficient security, by the Department of Social Services, and for whom 'tougher' legislation was needed. It was felt by these groups that judges did not have enough power in that they could only recommend placement.

When instituted, Compulsory Care was found to be a radical departure from tradition in the area of residential child care in the Province of Alberta, and caused some turmoil in the field. A wide range of types of compulsory care programs developed, some being very open, others closed. More importantly, however, there was confusion on the part of those directly dealing with the children, about the purpose of compulsory care programs - some viewing it as short term treatment, others seeing it as a highly structured program intending to deter misbehaving children.

In the minds of many child care practitioners, there was a need for an evaluation of the effect of compulsory care. This descriptive study intended to provide an initial step in that direction.

PURPOSE OF THIS STUDY

Only recently, five years after the implementation of the Compulsory Care Amendment, has any systematic study been made of the characteristics of those children who come into care through this procedure. This study attempted to follow up on what inquiry had been done (Alberta, 1982, July), and to present a comprehensive picture of the range of behavioral, attitudinal characteristics of all children in all the compulsory care settings in the province, on a specific date. It was felt that an estimate of the severity and range of behavior and attitudes of these children

would be helpful to those directly caring for the children, for those judges who send them to compulsory care, and for those officials in the Alberta Social Services Department who make decisions as to which designated setting a child is sent. It was also thought that this information would be helpful or of interest to those responsible for longer range planning within the department.

In summary, the purposes were as follows:

A. To obtain demographic and normed behavioral, attitudinal, academic and I.Q. information on all compulsory care children in the province, February 11, 1982.

B. To make conclusions about the range of this behavioral and attitudinal data within compulsory care as a whole and within each compulsory care setting.

C. To determine any trends in the severity of behaviors and attitudes by analyzing these data by region of referral, family characteristics, referral committee, as well as several other variables.

D. To offer this information to both those providing care directly and those planning for these children, so that it may be used as a basis for future research.

METHODS AND PROCEDURES

At the time of this study, a group of Directors of Youth Assessment Centres and Treatment Centres across the province (all of whom are responsible for compulsory care children) were establishing a data

collection system for their own purposes. The author was able to be involved in that process and consequently the basic data system they arrived at served as the instrument by which all demographic information on the children in this study was collected. Three separate and distinct data collection systems had been developed at three treatment centres in the province. Essentially, the work of this committee was to amalgamate the three systems into one. Actual data collection was done by institutional staff members.

In addition, behavioral and attitudinal information was gathered by institutional staff following training. Academic assessments were provided by Special Education teachers employed on each site, and intellectual assessments were completed through special funding provided by the Alberta Department of Social Services and Community Health.

DEFINITIONS

Terms which are used throughout this report and which may be confusing to those unfamiliar with the operation of the Alberta Department of Social Services and Community Health are defined below:

Youth Assessment Centres: A series of small institutions located throughout the province designed to provide short term placements for children on a regional basis. Such placements may be either temporary "shelter" placements, a remand placement for children facing charges or a Compulsory Care placement. The 7 Youth Assessment Centres have

all been constructed within the past 6 years and are very similar in design. They provide beds for either 10 or 20 children. Centres are located in Medicine Hat, Lethbridge, High Prairie, Grande Prairie, Lac La Biche, Red Deer and Fort McMurray.

Compulsory Care: A closed residential program for a "select minority" of emotionally disturbed children and/or delinquent children, with a treatment focus. Compulsory care placements are authorized by an amendment to the Alberta Child Welfare Act, Chapter 45 of the Revised Statutes of Alberta, 1970, which empowers a judge of juvenile and family court or any judge conducting a juvenile court hearing to make a Compulsory Care Order for a child who is considered to be "a danger to himself and/or others, or is otherwise out of control", so that he be confined for a period not exceeding 90 days in a designated compulsory care setting. This amendment also empowers the Director of Child Welfare to confine a child in a compulsory care setting for a period of up to 30 days, through a Compulsory Care Certificate. After either a judge or the Director of Child Welfare has decided a child should be placed in Compulsory Care, a Regional Placement Committee closest to the geographical area decides which of 12 settings he shall be sent to. These settings include:

Youth Assessment Centre, Lac La Biche
Youth Assessment Centre, High Prairie
Youth Assessment Centre, Fort McMurray
Youth Assessment Centre, Grande Prairie
Sifton Children's Centre, Lethbridge
Youth Assessment Centre, Red Deer
Youth Assessment Centre, Medicine Hat
Westfield, Edmonton

William Roper Hull Home, Calgary
Children's Service Centre, Calgary
Youth Development Centre, Edmonton
Enviros Wilderness Program, Calgary

In the case of a Compulsory Care Certificate, the Director of Child Welfare must be satisfied of the existence of three conditions. That the child:

> . . . is suffering from an emotional or behavioral disturbance, and,
>
> . . . is in a condition presenting a danger to himself or others or is otherwise out of control, and,
>
> . . . that it is in the best interests of the child that the child be confined in an institution (Sec. 88, Child Welfare Act).

Similarly, a judge, before making a Compulsory Care Order, must be satisfied that the child:

> . . . is in a condition presenting a danger to himself or others or is otherwise out of control, and,
>
> . . . it is in the best interests of the child that the child be confined to an institution (Sec. 87, Child Welfare Act).

Treatment Centre: A residential program for children aged 8-16, which provides remedial care for periods up to 18-24 months, but normally for a period less than 12 months. Such care normally includes family therapy. Treatment Centres would include the Youth Development Centre

(Edmonton), Marydale (Edmonton), William Roper Hull Home (Calgary), Margaret House (Calgary), Mapleridge (Edmonton), Westfield (Edmonton), Woods Christian Home (Calgary). Some treatment centres have components which are designated Compulsory Care programs.

Group Home: A small residential program for children which may have treatment goals for each child. Group homes care for 4 to 6 children, often after a period in a treatment centre. Usually the children in group homes are those for whom placement with their family is not adviseable. Often children are placed in group homes or foster homes following a period of time in a Compulsory Care setting.

Receiving Facility: A residential resource to temporary emergency placement. Often, Youth Assessment Centres are used as receiving centres.

Regional Placement Committee: A group of social service professionals from within a specific geographical area, who determine and approve on behalf of the Director of Child Welfare, all placements of all children within that area who are thought by a Social Worker to require a Compulsory Care program, or who have been ordered to a Compulsory Care placement by a judge in that geographical area.

LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

(1) A serious limitation of this study comes from the large amount of missing data both in I.Q. and Jesness Inventory scores. Consequently in testing for significant differences, the small frequencies in some cells has prevented proper statistical analysis. However, in some cases, trends may be evident and the hope exists that with ongoing collection of data, through the Alberta Institutional Information System (A.I.I.S.), questions unanswered here may be dealt with later in A.I.I.S. reports.

(2) Because this study was the dry run for the ongoing information system, all data were collected by numerous child care workers or social workers at the 12 various compulsory care agencies. Consistency in filling out data sheets according to the proper definitions and instructions may be lacking because, although these child care workers were trained in filling out the data sheets, this represented a less experienced process than is ideal.

In order to reduce these sources of error, every data sheet was checked for obvious mistakes (i.e. entering a "5" when there were only 0-4 possible answers). In addition, 23 data sheets from a variety of agencies were double-checked for accuracy against the child's "Central Office" file located in Edmonton. An average of 1.8 errors (of a possible total of 70) were found amongst these data sheets, which was found by the author to be surprisingly low.

(3) It was the original intention, in this study, to use the same test (The Wide Range Achievement Test), to consistently determine the

academic achievement of each child. This proved to be unworkable because manpower and economic resources were not sufficient to test all those children who did not have updated WRAT scores. It was also believed that such additional testing would be too disruptive to the school and residential programs. Instead of WRAT scores, grade levels as determined by tests normally in use in each setting were used, in the three areas of math, spelling and reading. Because there is some variation in grade levels determined by different tests, only an approximate assessment of academic achievement is reported in this study.

ORGANIZATION OF THE THESIS

In Chapter One of this thesis the author describes the original challenge of this study and its form in general terms.

In Chapter Two the author highlights some events in the history of care for children outside the family that the author found useful in understanding present circumstances. Compulsory Care facilities are described. Rationales for the use of the descriptive instruments are presented.

In Chapter Three the actual procedure followed in this study is described, with the connection of it to the implementation of the Alberta Institutional Information System.

In Chapter Four the results of the survey are reported.

Some possible conclusions and implications of the information collected are explored in Chapter Five.

CHAPTER TWO

SOME HISTORICAL AND PHILOSOPHICAL ASPECTS OF CARE FOR CHILDREN APART FROM THEIR FAMILIES

The following represents a brief outline of the historical developments within the field of what is now called "residential child care", so that present circumstances, particularly Compulsory Care, can be seen in perspective.

The first institution singularly designed for juveniles, The New York House of Refuge was built in 1825. This institution was constructed at a time when there was increasing faith in education as a means of social control over inferior, aberrant classes of people, notably the poor. It was built in a period when "reformists" were becoming more influential. In the field of adult corrections, institutions which used prolonged solitary confinement, and severe punishment, were being questioned and investigated and, in some cases, replaced. The New York House of Refuge, intended to educate and reform, believed that

> "the minds of children, naturally pliant, can, by early instruction, be formed and moulded to our wishes . . . the tender mind can be easily made to love all that is excellent in virtue itself, and to perceive the advantages which will be obtained from observing its dictates . . . "
> (quoted in Schlossman, 1978, p.22)

Above all else, this institution reflected the universal agreement of the time, that children should not be confined with adult offenders. However, the prevailing beliefs of the period about essential nature of the delinquent, whether adult or juvenile, still emphasized their inherent, genetic moral inferiority; the role of education was to

combat this nature.

The managers of The New York House of Refuge were confused about whether they were running a prison or a school, but they were ". . . very frank in discussing the Refuge as an instrument for compelling lower-class children to conform to middle-class standards of behavior" (Schlossman, 1977, p.24). The refuge, therefore, was a punishment which was intended to deter; and was therefore consistent with the prevailing justification of punishment:

> "if (punishment) ought at all to be admitted, it ought only to be admitted in as far as it promises to exclude some greater evil" (Jeremy Benthan, quoted in Platt, 1967, p.16).
>
> "Our primary duty . . . is to treat the culprit that many other persons may be rendered better, or prevented from being worse, by dread of the same treatment and making this the principal object, to combine with it as much as possible the improvement of the individual" (quoted by Radzinowicz and Turner, 1943).

Ultimately, The New York House of Refuge and similar facilities modelled after it, deteriorated:

> "In practice, The New York House of Refuge, like its counterparts in Philadelphia and Boston, did not abandon physical coercion in favor of emulation, and did not provide inmates with the skills and attitudes necessary to achieve success in society . . . the daily routine . . . was similar to that at Auburn and Sing Sing, with an emphasis on order, firm discipline, and elaborately detailed work schedules . . . inmates were regularly whipped or placed in solitary confinement for failing to conform to the daily regime" (Schlossman, 1977, p.30-31).

In the 1850's and 60's, to replace large reformatories (housing from 600 - 1000 juveniles), smaller, "family reform schools" developed, where

> ". . . anywhere from one to three dozen inmates with similar personality traits were placed in small homes or cottages under the supervision, ideally, of a surrogate father and mother. Each family lived, worked and attended school together, meeting other inmates only on infrequent ceremonial occasions . . . withdrawal of "familial" affection would substitute effectively for punishment . . . the emphasis was on the manipulation and evocation of children's native emotional resources"(Schlossman, 1977, p.38-39).

The family reform school was based on an ideal philosophy which was less deterministic, which relied less on the concept of inherent inferiority, and more on the ability of education to reform character or personality that had been effected by social and family conditions. However, as in the case of The House of Refuge, the intentions of those who designed the family reform schools were often inconsistent with the practices of those who ran the schools and the needs of the legislators and the communities. For example, in the Wisconsin Reform School, the "affectional discipline" characteristic of the approach to be used with the small family groups and the belief in the ". . . inborn potential for good which needed to be drawn out by love . . . " (p. 112, Schlossman) were forgotten. The family grouping system eventually became the opportunity for a classification system which the most difficult, "worst" children were all placed together and regarded as

natural-born criminals justifiably the recipients of custodial care and additional punitive controls (Brenzel, 1980). This classification process is evident recently as well (cf Polsky, 1969).

During the period of the family reform school, girls came under heavier treatment by courts than did boys. Schlossman and Wallach (1978) document that girls were more often sent to reformatories than boy delinquents, and for much less serious offences such as "immorality" which might be referred to today as sexual precocity. Such treatment was based on the view that "immoral" girls were

> ". . . mainly daughters of immigrants, who, according to contemporary racial mythology, were instinctively emotional and lacking in self restraint . . . were morally and biologically perverse . . . (whose) intelligence was so far below normal that they could never learn to control their instincts" (Schlossman and Wallach, 1978, p. 70, 78).

Schlossman and Wallach (1978) as well as Brenzel (1980) argue that such treatment of girls was based on a special fear of the loss of purity of the social order; it was felt that girls could be ". . . destructive of public morality" (Brenzel, 1980, p.107).

CHILD CARE IN ALBERTA

If the real but unstated purpose of juvenile correctional programs in the United States was to control the poor and assimilate immigrants (Platt, 1969), in Canada the goal of assimilation was publicly stated.

At about the same time that the Government of the City of New York established the House of Refuge, missionaries like Lacombe and the McDougalls established residential schools for Native children at mission sites with the belief that ". . . the only way to assimilate Native children into 'white' culture was to isolate them from their parents (Meen and Chubb, 1981, p.16). In 1863, Catholic nuns, first at Lac Ste. Anne, then at the missions of St. Albert and Lac La Biche, cared for Indian and Metis orphans. In 1883, Sir John A. MacDonald authorized the establishment of three industrial schools for Indian children ". . . to further their assimilation into 'non-Indian" society . . . " (Meen and Chubb, 1981, p.17). Like institutions in the U.S., these facilities cared for children once placed, until they reached their mid or late teens.

In Canada, like the U.S., beginning in the late 1880's, the thinking about the care of children changed to emphasize the importance of the environment in which the child is to be raised, and less so the child's inherent nature (which, in turn, was determined by his moral inheritance). "In this new view, children were seen less as entities to be worked into proper shape and more as beings of potential, which, to develop, required the proper, caring environment" (Meen and Chubb, 1981, p.20). In this view, ". . . since children were to be weaned into salvation, they could no longer be viewed . . . as <u>miniature adults</u> . . . " (Schlossman, 1977, p.50). Consequently, there were significant changes in the care of children outside their families. "Family reform schools" were seen to be just as detrimental to the

proper development of child as the gaols and Houses of Refuge that they had replaced. Foster care was the most popularly proposed alternative, and the Canadian Juvenile Delinquents Act of 1908, modelled after the Illinois Juvenile Court Act of 1899, empowered judges to direct "delinquent" children to foster home placements.

In Alberta, the Children's Protection Act of 1909 provided a very broad definition of a dependent or neglected child, so much so that there was

> . . . so fine a line separating the neglected from the delinquent child as to render the distinction inconsequential (Meen and Chubb, 1981, p.26).

This lack of a distinction was characteristic of the approach taken to children through the continent. This Act also provided for the formation of Children's Aid Societies in several cities, whose job it was to ". . . use every means within their power to improve the home conditions before taking the matter to a Court or making an application for the care and custody of children" (Annual Report of the Superintendent of Neglected Children, 1910-1911, Alberta, quoted in Meen and Chubb, 1981, p.33). Most children who were removed from their families in Alberta were placed in country foster homes, although this practice was not without its critics. For example, Archbishop E.J.Legal, in 1914, in a letter to R.B.Chadwick, Superintendent of Dependent Children, stated

> (quoted in Meen and Chubb, 1981) ". . . for most children, especially orphans and neglected children, a complete course of education in a special institution or boarding school would be far more advantageous . . . than foster homes" (Meen and Chubb, 1981, p.53).

The Industrial Training School for Boys at Portage La Prairie was used, however, in many cases, sometimes by Police Magistrates whose intentions were punitive. A.M.MacDonald, Superintendent of Neglected Children, in 1917 commented:

> "Juvenile Courts were organized not as Criminal Courts, but as Child-Saving Institutions, from which it was expected all semblance of criminal procedure and penal methods would be excluded . . . Frequently, the commissioner, in a spirit of vindictiveness, commits the child to some Institution, with the role aim of punishment" (Annual Report of Superintendent of Neglected Children, 1917, p.27, quoted in Meen and Chubb, 1981, p.56).

Foster care became even more popular in the period 1920-1947, in part due to its "cost effectiveness". In 1925, even fostering was evaluated in terms of its cost and adoption of dependent children was encouraged because it saved the continuing supervision costs of the salaries of welfare workers. The use of local children's shelters, which had developed in 1910-12, for short term placements of children (in order to determine placement needs and arrange for such), declined also during this period, to keep costs down. In 1925, the Edmonton Children's Shelter was closed down. The Provincial Government was criticized for its ". . . consistent principle . . of cheapness" (I.O.D.E. Study) upon which the Child Welfare system operated.

Although the use of children's temporary shelters was reduced in the period 1920-1947, privately operated institutions, such as the Salvation Army Home in Calgary, the Good Shepherd Home, the Ruthernian Home, the Beulah Mission Home and later the Kiwanis Home in Edmonton,

the Youville Convent in St. Albert, and the Woods Christian Home, originally in Olds, continued to care for needy children.

The period from 1935 on, in Alberta, represents an increasing trend returning towards greater government control and coordination of Child Welfare services. "Quite simply, the decentralized fragmented system with its reliance on voluntary organizations could not cope with what the depression brought" (Meen and Chubb, 1981, p.70).

An inquiry by the Provincial Government into Child Welfare service was conducted in 1943. This inquiry re-affirmed an already existing philosophy: homes were preferable to institutions, prevention of social problems should be emphasized and neglect or delinquency is explained by family conditions. It also documented several weaknesses in the system including inadequate supervision of foster homes, inadequate provision of "girl's industrial schools", inadequate aftercare for children leaving the, then, largely private, institutions, and it raised the debate about the need for an industrial school for boys.

An independent study commissioned by the Imperial Order Daughters of the Empire (I.O.D.E.) in 1947 was much more critical of the Government. It noted:

1. the "dictatorial" and centralized control by the Director of Child Welfare,
2. that foster parents and private charters providing care for dependent children were not financially supported by the Government,
3. that commercial boarding homes were poorly inspected and providing

poor care,

4. that the detention facility for boys in Edmonton was inadequate - ". . . a mockery of our boasted Canadian civilization (I.O.D.E. report, p. 147).

5. that foster placements were completed carelessly.

In 1947 an Alberta Royal Commission acknowledged the inadequacy of detention facilities, recommended that the juvenile courts be transferred from the Child Welfare Branch, and that no child should be placed in detention without proceeding through court. Like the I.O.D.E. study, this commission found that foster care was inadequate and should be paid, and that adoption procedures needed closer scrutiny, particularly the practice of adopting out of Canada. It also recommended an industrial school of a cottage type with small groups, because there appeared to be a "hard core" group of about 150 delinquent boys in the province who required such a setting.

Similar concerns were heard in the 1950's.

> "During 1950 and early 1951, there was an increase in car thefts in Edmonton, and many more cases were being transferred to police court for disposition. There was a strong feeling the Juvenile Court lacked the power and facilities to handle these young people causing a good deal of adverse publicity and public demand for action" (Dr. Jean Nelson, Supplementary Report in Juvenile Delinquency in Alberta, 1967, p. 37).

During this period, responsibility for delinquent children was transferred from the Public Welfare Department to the Attorney General's

Department because it was felt that ". . . the problem of juvenile delinquency was primarily one concerning the administration of justice and that prevention was largely a problem of police detection and law enforcement" (Nelson, 1967, p.40). Two reformatories were established, one for boys at Bowden and one for girls in Edmonton, the Alberta Institute for Girls.

In 1967, the Provincial Government built the first publicly owned institution for emotionally disturbed or neglected children, the Diagnostic and Treatment Centre, later to be called Westfield. The care of delinquent children was returned to the Department of Social Development from the Attorney General's Department in 1970, and in the same year the reformatory for delinquent boys at Bowden was closed down, and a co-educational treatment program was developed at the Alberta Institute for Girls and renamed the Youth Development Centre. This program

> ". . . stood in striking contrast to what it had replaced. Many professional staff were employed, an innovative school program implemented and a variety of recreational and counselling resources drawn together to encourage behavior change in the delinquent children it served" (Meen and Chubb, 1981, p.89).

This development and establishment of the Diagnostic and Treatment Centre was clearly based, in part, on principles very similar to those voiced by "Child Savers" (Platt, 1969) many years earlier; that delinquency was related to unfavorable learning conditions in the family of the child, and that the child could learn

new and more "adaptive" behaviors.

As noted earlier (p. 18), a debate about how delinquents should be handled, was evident in this province in 1917, and had been continuing since the late nineteenth century with the first "Child Savers". This debate involves, on one side, the argument that delinquent children should be cared for and "treated", and on the other, that they should be dealt with powerfully by a juvenile court with authority and the ability to effectively punish and deter them. An Alberta Royal Commission on Juvenile Delinquency in 1967 supported the latter argument. It stated

> ". . . in all these areas where laws exist to govern human conduct the prime purpose of the law is for the benefit and protection of society generally . . . if the individual, adult or child, can be cured, curbed, rehabilitated or benefitted by the operation of the law so much the better, but this aspect of law is a secondary consideration and always must remain so" (Alberta Royal Commission on Juvenile Delinquency, 1967, p.21).

This commission felt that the Federal Juvenile Delinquents Act

> "has deprived society in general, and juveniles in particular of equality and protection before the law (ibid, p.28).

An Alberta Board of Review, 1977, argued similarly and recommended that juvenile court judges be empowered to directly confine delinquent children for up to three years. This committal, echoing the Alberta

Royal Commission of 1947, referred to 100-150 "hard core", chronic offenders in the province for whom there was no residential facility secure enough, and recommended the construction of several closed institutions. While this Board of Review was preparing its final report, the Alberta legislature passed the "Compulsory Care" Amendment to the Child Welfare Act, which empowered judges to confine children for 3 months rather than the recommended 3 years.

The intent of the Compulsory Care Amendment was primarily, then, to provide juvenile court judges with a clear authority to confine children, which up to that time they did not have. As noted by the 1967 Alberta Royal Commission of Juvenile Delinquency, under the Juvenile Delinquent's Act, a judge could only confine children in "industrial schools" (p. 39). Bowden and Alberta Institute for Girls were not designated as industrial schools. The Superintendent of Juvenile Offenders (later to be called the Director of Child Welfare) was confining children in Bowden and A.I.G., ". . . a clear breach of Section 26 of the (Juvenile Delinquent's) Act (ibid, p.39). These confinements were carried out under an untested authority provided by the Child Welfare Act, but which, if tested, was not thought to be strong enough. The Compulsory Care Amendment gave both the juvenile court judges and the Director of Child Welfare, this extraordinary parental authority.

However, like other initiatives discussed above, this Amendment may not be seen or used in a manner with which it was intended. Some police personnel and judges may see a short stay in compulsory care

for a child as an effective, short and quick punishment designed for "shock" value. As well, social workers may use the relatively quick procedure of placing children in compulsory care as a placement-type solution to a problem which may require a much more sophisticated approach.

SUMMARY

The philosophies underlying the care of children away from their families has moved from a punitive one to one which held that children would benefit from large institutional training which would counteract genetic and moral inferiority, to the environmentalistic, educational philosophy underlying reform schools, to a more contemporary individualized treatment approach. It is clear that despite the intent of the philosophy, often the practise - the actual care received by the children - was something less. Within the Province of Alberta, the first confinements of children served the purpose of cultural integration. The confinement of delinquent children seems to have been largely related to the need to curb misbehavior and protect the property of the public. There has however, been an on-going debate about how this can be done; either to consider the delinquent child as similar to the neglected child and provide care and treatment, or to handle delinquent children under due process of law in order to develop a greater sense of responsibility. The shuffle of the responsibility for delinquent children from the Department of Public Welfare to the Attorney General's Department and then back again in the past 40 years, seems evidence of this confusion .

DESCRIPTION OF COMPULSORY CARE FACILITIES

When making a recommendation for placement of a child in a Compulsory Care setting, a social worker is directed to consider the following:

> ...the well being of the child.... The child's placement should be selected to ensure that his needs are best met and the degree of security and restriction does not exceed that which is necessary to meet the child's needs.
> The least restrictive alternative appropriate for the needs of the child should be selected. A compulsory care placement should be selected only when no less restrictive alternative is feasible.
> Placement in a secure setting is justified only if the magnitude of the risk to the child or society clearly outweighs the loss of liberty and potential harm resulting from a compulsory care setting.
> A single serious act on the part of a child may not necessarily warrant placement in a compulsory care resourse. The act may have been an isolated incident and before recommending compulsory care the childwelfare worker should have grounds to believe that the child, if left at liberty, would commit further serious acts.
> (Social Services, Child Welfare Programs, p161).

The twelve designated compulsory care facilities are , for the most part, the most recently constructed child care facilities in the province. Therefore, they are attractive, bright and roomy. In the Youth Assessment Centres, which were originally built to provide a regionalized assessment program for children, each child has his or her own bedroom. Common areas include sunken living rooms with fireplaces, well equipped games ares, small gyms, TV rooms and large bright dining rooms.

In addition to providing programs for compulsory care children,

Youth Assessment Centers often house neglected children temporarily removed from their homes or waiting longer term placement, or children charged with an offense awaiting trail, or children under arrest. All these types of children can be living in the same facility.

Even though there exists a range of degree of security within the group of compulsory care settings, it is the intention of these programs to prevent a child from leaving the program until the date of discharge indicated on the order or certificate. Running away from a compulsory care facility is considered a 'serious' event. In the case of an 'AWOL', warrents for arrest are often issued.

The program statement of the Youth Assessment Centre in Fort MacMurray describes the program as

> ...a secure 20 bed facility for th detention, care, assessment, education and rehabilitation of youth between 10 and 16 years of age.... Every person is responsible for his own actions and has control over the outcome of his actions. Over and above basic care, everything the Centre offers is regarded as a priviledge that must be earned by responsible behavior.... The overall focus of the program is one of assessment.
> (Program Statement, Youth Assessment Centre, Fort MacMurray, Section A)

The Westfield Policy Manual states that

> ...because the definition of compulsory care is quite explicit, ie. "confinement in an institution", Unit Three at Westfield... is a secure, locked setting. Our security is maintained by locked doors, high student/staff ratio and built-in safeguards against unauthorized leaves.... Our goals are full assessment... and treatment.... The main component of Unit Three treatment is the involved relationship and the formation of these through the care and dedication of those involved.
> (Westfield Policy Manual, Section 6)

PREVIOUS RESEARCH INVOLVING THE DESCRIPTIVE INSTRUMENTS

The Weschler Intelligence Scale for Children - Revised (WISC-R)

Weschler (1974) states that general intelligence, defined as "...the overall capacity of the individual to understand and cope with the world around him" (p. 5), is inferred from responses to a variety of stimuli - like those contained in the WISC-R. This is the only defense Weschler makes for the content validity of the WISC-R. This weakness is underlined by Littel (1960). However, several studies since Littel's review of the WISC-R have demonstrated its predictive validity (ie. its ability to predict subsequent behavior). For example, Hartlage and Steele (1977) found the verbal, performance and full scale scores to correlate significantly with academic achievement tests and school grades. Brooks (1977) found that the WISC-R "...predicts reading, spelling and acheivement in a significant manner" (p. 30). Conklin and Dockrell (1967) found the WISC to consistently predict teacher assigned marks over a four year period (with correlations from .44 to .67) and further that full scale and verbal scale scores were better predictors than performance scale scores. The WISC has been found to be a better predictor of achievement test scores (WRAT) for elementary grade Educable Mentally Retarded students than for primary grade EMR students (Mayor, 1958). Correlations of .73 were found between WISC scores and average grades, and .64 between WISC scores and the STEP achievement test.

Of secondary interest is the relationship of the WISC-R sub-test

scores to behavior disorders. Weschler (1949) in the original normative study, notes that delinquent children as well as the "...adult male psychopath" (p. 156) are characterized by a significantly higher performance score than verbal score. Prentice and Kelly (1963) record nine studies of delinquent adolescent populations characterized by "...significant elevation of performance over verbal I.Q.'s" (p. 333). Camp (1966) also noted "...higher performance I.Q. than verbal I.Q. occurred significantly more frequently than expected regardless of EEG classification" (p.351) in adolescent delinquents. However, when studying younger children, Camp et al. (1977) found no sigificant differences between aggressive boys and non-aggressive boys. Camp's criterion for aggressiveness, however, were behavior check list scores rather than actual referral to a clinic as in the previous study (Camp, 1966).

Other studies (Hays, Solway and Schrinor, 1978; Matarazzo, 1972; and Solway, Hays,Roberts and Cody, 1975) have supported the notion that delinquents generally show higher performance I.Q.'s than verbal I.Q.'s on the WISC-R.

However, Jaynes and Bensch (1981) failed to find support for this thesis, when studying 90 adolescent "adjudicated white male delinquents", but did find that higher performance scores distinguished between recidivists and non-recidivists. Guerlin, Ladd et al (1966) reviewed 5 studies which found higher performance than verbal scores in groups of adult criminals and delinquents. Fernald and

Wisser (1967) found similar results.

This relatively large sample of behaviour disorder and delinquent children has afforded a good opportunity to further study this question and compare an Alberta sample with other delinquent groups that have heen studied.

THE JESNESS INVENTORY

The Jesness Inventory (JI) was originally designed to evaluate attitude change in treatment (Jesness, 1976, 1963) but is used more as an instrument which identifies levels of delinquency.

The Jesness Inventory is normed for youths of both sexes aged 8-18 and is comprised of 155 true-false items. The level of reading required by the respondent is low. The item content is more attuned to youths who are offenders than adults or cases of severe psychopathology (Martin, 1980, p. 10). The test is comprised of eleven scales: Social Maladjustment, Value Orientation, Immaturity, Autism, Alienation, Manifest Aggression, Withdrawal, Social Anxiety, Repression, Denial and the Asocial Index, which weighs eight of the previous subscales plus other selected items. (Appendix E). Standard scores on each of the eleven subscales theoretically range from 0 to 100 with a mean of 50. Jesness (1979) states that scores 1 standard deviation above or below the mean is "...worthy of comment" (p. 15).

There have been relatively few published studies using the Jesness Inventory. Kelly and Bair (1969) used the Jesness Inventory to measure attitudinal changes in 60 delinquent participants of an

Outward Bound program, aged 15-18, and found significant improvement on the Social Maladjustment, Value Orientation, Alienation, Manifest Aggression Scales, which also correlated with improvement in measures in self concept. Cowden, Peterson and Pacht (1969) found that delinquent youth who were assessed by 2 independent psychologists ratings as having a poor prognosis (their ability to stay out of trouble in the future), scored significantly higher on the Social Maladjustment, Value Orientation, Immaturity, Alienation and Asocial Index Scales of the Jesness Inventory. These same scales also differentiated youths on the basis of their relationships with counsellors, but the Asocail Index did not discriminate between sub-groups rated on their overall adjustment to the institutional program. The authors also concluded that the Jesness Inventory consistently discriminated among the sub-groups of delinquents more significantly than the MCI (Minnuster Counselling Inventory) (p. 60). Fraas and Price (1972) studied 141 adults in a U.S. Army Correctional Facility who were incarcerated for A.W.O.L.offences and found that the Jesness Inventory given at the start of "restoration training" did not identify those soldiers who failed to report to duty following release and that only "... some scales hold relative merit in predicting a small category of offenders who are discharged during their time at the facility ..." (p. 742) because of severe behaviour problems. Smith (1975) compared the Jesness Inventory to the Eysenck Personality Inventory using 153 delinquent, imprisoned males aged 16-20, and noted several significant correlations between Jesness Scales and Eysenck scales. These findings however, were not strong enough to support the notion that separate

scales on the 2 tests measured the same dimensions (e.g. Eysenck's psychoticism and Jesness' Autism).

Vallance and Forrest (1971) in Scotland added validity to the Jesness Inventory by finding that several of the subscales, including the Asocial Index, discriminated between delinquent and non-delinquent youths across age levels 13 to 16. They suggested, however, that some subscales, particularly Alienation, should be specially weighted for Scottish populations.

Although Fisher (1967) had previously suggested the possibility of an acquiescent response set in an English delinquent sample, Vallance and Forrest take issue with his thesis and instead argue for special weighting. Fisher did find that the Jesness Inventory discriminated effectively between delinquent and non-delinquent groups.

Shark and Handal (1977) have claimed that the Jesness Inventory does not adequately discriminate between delinquent and non-delinquent groups. Using a delinquent group of 59 short-term residents in a St. Louis Detention Center and a non-delinquent group from the public school system, they found a 52% misclassification rate amongst the delinquent group when the Jesness Inventory was used for classsification They also reported that for many of the subscales, the test-retest reliability of the JI over a one week period did not meet the .75 "...criterion of reliability for a test used in an applied manner." (p. 675). In response, Jesness (1978) has argued that: (1) the standard of reliability proposed by Shark and Handal is too high, and (2) their delinquent sample was not truly delinquent because they had not been formally adjudicated delinquent.

Martin (1980) studied four groups: (1) behavior problem or acting out youth in the community, (2) institutionalized youth not yet formally adjudicated delinquent, (3) formally charged and adjudged delinquents, and (4) a control group of non-delinquents. He found that six of the twelve subscales differentiated between delinquent and non-delinquent, and that of these six, several distinguished between some or all of the levels of delinquency in his study, and further, that the Asocial Index, often described as a poor identifier of delinquency, differentiated significantly between all four groups. Martin concluded that "... the concept of asocialization or social acting out by youths can be evaluated differentially with the Ascoial Index of the Jesness Inventory" (p. 13) and that "...the next step in research with the JI should address the difficult area of predictive validity" (p. 14)

Finally, Krausher (1980), in studying several variables with delinquent groups, found significant differences on four JI subscales (including the Asocial Index) between delinquent and non-delinquent groups, but his means are not as high as those reported by Martin (1980) or Jesness (1972).

The Questionnaire

The questionnaire designed for this study intended only to gather family and demographic information which was descriptive, and did not intend to support or disprove causal theories relating child development and family circumstances. One reason this study was

only descriptive in nature was that the correlational method is fraught with methodological problems. For example, there are obvious problems involved if information about both independent and dependent variables is gathered from the same source. Such would be the case if this study attempted to correlate questionnaire data about family conditions with present behavior patterns, because all relevant information comes from the same source - the child's Social Services file. Because of these methodological problems, "...conscientious crtitics have raised legitimate doubts about the impact of parental behavior on personality development" (McCord, 1979, p. 1477). A much superior method (Robins, 1966) fo testing a causal thesis between early experience of the child and later development is longitudinal research (Robins, 1966; Jessor and Jessor, 1977; McCord, 1979).

One use of this purely descriptive data is to make comparisons with other populations. One such comparison is with a group of children admitted to Alberta Child Welfare institutions between 1969 and 1971, prior to the initiation of Compulsory Care. This study generally described children in institutions as coming from "...families with intense marital, physical, and mental problems,... single parent families, families on public assistance and families with low education." (Alberta, 1974, p. 177).

CHAPTER THREE

DESIGN OF THE STUDY

General Description

This descriptive study was undertaken for three reasons:

1. to provide an indication of how the Compulsory Care legislation in the Province of Alberta is being used,
2. to follow-up on and provide additional information to a previous study of children in Compulsory Care, by providing complementary information,
3. to provide a basis for continuing research in this area, by indicating areas needing further investigation.

Subjects

Subjects in this study were all of the children contained in the designated Compulsory Care facilities in the Province of Alberta on February 11, 1982. It was felt that on this date a typical group of children would be in Compulsory Care, unlike, for example, during a summer month when children in Alberta do not attend school and consequently do not show certain behavior probelms. This group totalled 151 children ranging in age from 11 to 17. They were all wards of the provincial Government and were placed by either an Order of a Juvenile Court judge, or a Certificate issued by the Director of

Child Welfare (refer to definitions, p. 6 - 8). Consequently, the subjects may generally be grouped into two categories: those children ordered to Compulsory Care, who have usually been found delinquent, and those children sent to Compulsory Care through a certificate, who exhibit behavior and/or emotional problems but who have not recently or ever been found to be delinquent.

Procedure

The author of this study was amember of a committee of a group of Directors of child care agencies in Alberta who were interested in establishing a uniform, computerized information system, so that information pertaining to the children they served could be quickly retreived. It was originally the intention of the author to independently describe the children in Compulsory Care. However, upon learning of the formation of the committee, the author was able to join forces with it.

The resulting questionnaire represented an amalgamation of several information systems that were already in existence, or were in the process of being developed. The largest part of that questionnaire, the 'intake' information (including child characteristics, family characteristics, placement and delinquent history, Jesness Inventory scores, academic grade level, and I.Q. scores) served as the basis of this descriptive study of "compulsory care" children only. The total questionnaire developed by this committee which includes discharge information and recommendations and follow-up information, comprises the Alberta Institutuinal Information System (AIIS). This system

will describe and track all children who entered all major residential resources in the Province, and is presently monitored and supervised by the Child Welfare Branch, Alberta Department of Social Services and Community Health.

The formulation of this questionnaire took place over the period from August, 1981 to January, 1982, in several meetings held at various locations throughout the Province.

The collection of the data for this study was the first step in the implementation of the larger Alberta Institutional Information System (AIIS). Consequently, child care workers in 12 different locations had to be trained in administration of the questionnaire. This process involved answering each item in the questionnaire, using information from a written personal file concerning each child, and from the child care worker's own personal knowledge of the child and his circumstances.

THE QUESTIONNAIRE

The questionnaire consisted of 38 variables (cf. Appendix D). Although the information gathered is believed to be extensive, a major consideration in the design of the questionnaire was the availability of information to the child care workers who completed it.

The questionnaire was field tested by research personnel and child care workers in 4 different settings. Some items, about which it proved too difficult to obtain relevent information, were dropped. It was further reviewed by the research staff of the Child Welfare Branch, Alberta Social Services and Community Health, and other changes were made. Further revisions were suggested by Alberta

Social Services Department Officials who had previous experience with information systems, eg. Employment Opportunities Branch. It was finally sanctioned by the group of Directors of the major child care agencies.

FIELD TRAINING

Because this study was the first step in the implementation of the ongoing Alberta Institutional Information System, it involved an extensive training component. Sufficient numbers of child care workers in each compulsory care facility had to learn how to fill out the data cheets (cf. Appendix D) by being instructed in the intent of each question, the specifics of each definition, and the likely sources of relevent information.

A training procedure was developed to reach these ends. At each setting, each member of the entire staff group was issued a "model" file, which contained information about a ficticious child. Each item on the questionnaire was then answered by a trainer (either the author or the User Sponsor of the Institutional Information System), in a modelling fashion, using the ficticious file. Then each child care worker filled out another data sheet using the file of a child presently living at the facility. Questions about each unique file were answered in front of the staff group. In addition, following these training sessions, both the author and the User Sponsor were available by telephone to all child care workers, when difficulty was encountered in finding the best answer to a question.

Training sessions, for purposes of the study, were held in all eleven compulsory care facilities throughout the province.

THE JESNESS INVENTORY

The Jesness Inventory (JI) was administered to each child by a child care worker in each compulsory care setting. These child care workers were instructed in the methods of administration of the Jesness Inventory by either the author or by the User Sponsor of the Alberta Institutional Information System. Usually, the test was either administered on a group basis or individually within one month of being admitted to the compulsory care setting.

Some difficulty was experienced with obtaining Jesness inventory scores. In some programs children were out of the facility (on camping trips or special leave) at the time of the administration of the test, and were not tested later. Several children refused to take the test and others obviously did not consider it seriously, for example, answering 'true' to all items. Those children who completed this test cooperatively, expressed satisfaction with it and showed curiosity about the results. The tests were hand-scored by the author and the results returned to each program.

GRADE LEVEL

Academic grade levels were determined by a variety of academic achievement tests, including the Wide Range Achievement Test (WRAT), the Peabody Individual Academic Test (PIAT), Schonell Word Reading Test and the Monroe Sherman Math Achievement Test.

These tests were administered by special education teachers employed in each setting (cf. limitations of the study), as a part of the normal operation of the educational program.

WESCHLER INTELLIGENCE SCALE FOR CHILDREN - REVISED

The WISC-R was administered by certified personnel, i.e. those

listed in the Alberta Department of Education, Learning Disability Registry. Each one of these testers lived in the community in which the compulsory care facility was located, and was familiar to institutional personnel and the characteristics of the children they tested. Only those children who did not have a record of a WISC-R assessment on their personal files within the previous two years were tested.

A memo, documenting that the child had been assessed for research purposes, was placed on the file of each child who was tested. An interpretation of the scores, for case management purposes, was made available to each child's social worker.

As with the Jesness Inventory, some children (4), refused to take this test. Others had recently been tested but the results were not made available to the author.

RATIONALE FOR THE SELECTION OF THE DESCRIPTIVE INSTRUMENTS

Jesness Inventory

The decision to use the Jesness Inventory as a descriptive instrument was based upon its past use with delinquent populations. Its ability to distinguish those children who are delinquent from those who are not (Cowden et al., 1969; Fisher, 1967; Fraas and Price, 1972; Jesness, 1966, Krausher, 1980; Martin, 1980), made this test more appropriate for this study than other tests which have been used in studying other kinds of populations, eg. psychiatric populations, or adults. The Jesness Inventory was designed especially for delinquent populations such as the one for whom Compulsory Care

is intended, and originated from a dissatisfaction with other instruments.

WISC-R

As noted earlier, the decision to include WISC-R scores in the description battery was based on upon the belief that the ability of children to be educated or trained is an important factor in the decision to commit that child to "...short-term treatment..." (Alberta, 1981, p. 161). The Weschler Intelligence Scale for Children is the most commonly used test in the Province of Alberta and this fact alone argued for its use in this study.

CHAPTER FOUR

RESULTS

As noted earlier, the Compulsory Care program was designed for a 'minority' of children. The results of this survey have addressed the question of the degree to which children living in Compulsory Care facilities on February 11, 1982, match those qualities of children for whom the program was designed.

CHILD CHARACTERISTICS

The sample consisted of 151 children. The children were unevenly distributed throughout the twelve Compulsory Care resources according to Table 1, Appendix A.

The ages of the children ranged from 11 to 17 years; the average age being 14.5 years (Table 2). Sixty percent (60%) of the children were between the ages of 14.6 to 15.5. Eighty percent (80%) were between the ages of 13.6 and 15.5. The program, then, serves a fairly select group in terms of age.

Sixty-two percent (62%) of the population was male, 37.7% female. These figures are consistent with another study of Compulsory Care (Alberta, 1982) and of other studies of children in care in the province of Alberta (Alberta, 1976). However, when looking at the distribution of sex differences according to the region from which they were referred to Compulsory Care, of notable interest is that the Edmonton area referred as many girls as boys. (Table 3).

The trend is similar for the Province's other large city, Calgary.

Sixty-four per cent (64%) of the children were Caucasian, and the remainder was made up of Treaty Indian (12%), Non-Treaty Indian (40%), and Metis (16.6%). The Northern areas of the Province tended to refer a larger proportion of Native and Metis children than did the Southern part; 52%, 44% and 43% for the Northern regions compared to 13% and 21% for the South (Table 4).

REGION MAKING REFERRAL

As documented in Table 4.1 most of the children placed in Compulsory Care settings have previously lived within the same region, or in a nearby region. That is, for the most part, the children have been placed as close to home as possible. This is true of all Compulsory Care settings except Enviros, which is a special wilderness program unavailable in other Compulsory Care settings, and for which children are especially selected.

PLACEMENT HISTORY

Ten per cent (10%) of the children in this sample had no previous placements outside their families prior to being placed in Compulsory Care. Thirteen per cent (13%) had only 1 previous placement (Table 5). Of those with only 1 previous placement (n=20), 6 had short term Detention placements. Two children had 46 and 58 placements respectively. In examining total placements by racial origin, it appears that Native and other races accounted for a smaller proportion of those children with few previous placemnts and an in-

creasing proportion (up to 50%) of those with 6-10 and 11+ previous placements (Table 5).

Thirty-four per cent (34%) of the children in this sample were living in a short term Detention facility prior to their Compulsory Care placement. This figure represents, it is assumed, children who have been charged and are placed in Compulsory Care as a result of a charge or charges, but would not represent all those Compulsory Care children placed because of charges. It is not discernible from these data which factors determine placement in Detention prior to Compulsory Care.

Almost thirty per cent (28.5%) of the children were removed from the homes of their natural parents to be placed in Compulsory Care. As noted above, 1/3 of these children would have had no other previous placements. Nine point three per cent (9.3%) of the sample came directly from other Compulsory Care settings. Another 8% had been placed in a hospital setting prior to Compulsory Care. Three per cent (3%) had been AWOL (absent from home or placement without permission) for one month or more prior to their placement in Compulsory Care. A total of 28% of the sample had been previously placed in a Compulsory Care setting within their last three placements. This figure does not represent the percentage of all children in this sample who had previous placements in Compulsory Care.

Jesness Inventory scores were sensitive to the number of placements these children experienced. Generally, those children who had few or no previous placements proved lower on most scales of the J.I. than those with several previous placements (Table 5.1).

FAMILY CHARACTERISTICS

Throughout the development of this questionnaire, the working committee became increasingly aware that it wanted to gather information about whatever group - family or substitute family group - that might have a significant influence on the child. The committee anticipated that for many children, foster parents and the foster family become as influential as a natural family. Therefore, rather than only describing the child's natural family, the committee defined "current family group" as:

> the most recent family group (foster, relative, adoptive or any other) that the child has lived with for at least two years (Appendix D).

Therefore, the committee decided to gather information on the current family group by asking 2 questions, one regarding the "mother-figure" and the other the "father-figure". By working with combinations of responses to these 2 questions, results have been analyzed around eight possible family groupings (Table 6).

From Table 6, it can be seen that the largest single family type is the single-mother type (26.5%). This figure is consistent with other studies done in Alberta of children in care (Alberta, 1982, p. 10). The single parent family group is over-represented in the sample, when comparison is made to the provincial norm for the same type of family, 7.1%. Twenty-four point five per cent (24.5%) of families can be characterized by mother and father living together. In general, a large proportion (62.3%) of the families from which these children come have, at some point, undergone a fundamental change in structure (i.e. one parent leaving, one parent re-marrying or forming

a new common-law relationship) or are under the stress of a single parent structure.

Of the total 37 families with both parents living together, 30 were Caucasian. Almost 1/2 of the single parent families were of Native or "other" racial origin.

The child care workers who filled out the data sheets were required to rank in order of importance those family characteristics which prevented the child from living with the family. Such a rating procedure falls prey to the problems of all subjective ratings. These data are presented, however, as a representation of the perspective of those persons working closely with the children placed in Compulsory care (Table 7).

When assessing the most important characteristic which prevented the child from living at home, child care workers tended to pin-point the child. Almost 50% of the situations were thought of as "problem specific to child". It may be that making these kinds of assessments become increasingly difficult for the child care workers; the number of "missing" responses or "no problem" responses increased from "most important" rating to "least important" rating.

FAMILY SIZE

The number of siblings in the family of each child is presented in Table 8. Siblings was defined as:

> . . . only those youth sharing the same biological mother (Appendix D).

Similar to other studies (Alberta, 1982, Conroy et al, 1981), these data indicate that children in Compulsory Care come from larger

families when compared to the Provincial average (2.3 children per family with children).

In this sample, the average family size for Caucasian families is 3.4; for Native (inclusion of "other"), 4.7.

INCOME

Seventeen point six per cent (17.6%) of the families of these children (for whom information is available) were receiving partial financial support from either the Provincial Government or Federal Department of Indian Affairs. Sixty-one point six per cent (61.6%) were either fully employed or self-supporting (see Table 9).

GOVERNMENT INVOLVEMENT WITH OTHER CHILDREN IN FAMILY

One half (52.2%) of the families from which these children come had at least one child who was presently or had, at some previous time, been involved with the Alberta Department of Social Services and Community Health. It is not known the exact nature of this involvement; it would range from a supervision service to wardship status. Thirty-five per cent (35%) had 1 or 2 children involved with the Alberta Government Department, and 11.9% had 3 or more children involved (see Table 11). These figures include consideration of those families without other siblings (n=6).

If the assumption is made that the pathology of a family environment is indicated by the number of children for whom the Provincial Government provides some Child Welfare service, the figures above may provide some indication of the nature of families of the children in Compulsory Care.

ADOPTION

Fourteen members (9.3%) of this sample of children were adopted. Four were adopted at birth, 2 were adopted between 6 months and 1 year of age, 4 at ages between 1 year and 2 years, and 4 were adopted when they were between the ages of 3 and 5 years.

DELINQUENT HISTORY

The data on offenses were analyzed by formings 7 groups:

1. Those with no offenses,

2. Those who had been convicted of statute offenses only (e.g. truancy, liquor-related offenses, traffic offenses, etc.),

3. Those who had committed 1 or 2 offenses against property (break and enter, theft),

4. Those who had committed any frequency of offenses against self (e.g. prostitition, alcohol or drug abuse),

5. Those who had committed 3 or more offenses against property,

6. Those who had committed 3 or more offenses against property and offenses against persons, and

7. Those who had committed 3 or more offenses against property, any offenses against persons and 3 or more offenses against self.

From Table 12 it can be seen that 15 children (9.9%) had committed no offenses. This figure is lower than that (17.5%) documented in earlier studies of Compulsory Care (Alberta, 1982, p. 33). Seventeen point two per cent (17.2%) had either no offenses or 2 or less statute offenses. Thirty-two point four per cent (32.4%) had either no offenses or either 2 or less statute or property offenses.

Forty-seven per cent (47%) had what could be considered a "serious" delinquency record, i.e. categories 5, 6 and 7 on Table 12. Boys were less likely to be found guilty of offenses termed "against self".

As documented earlier, the Jesness Inventory (Jesness, 1972) has some utility in the identification of juvenile delinquency. The means of all sub-scale scores of the Jesness Inventory were tested for significance of difference between means for each group outlined in Table 14. No significant differences were found. Scores on the sub-scales SM (Social Maladjustment) and AI (Asocial Index) are relatively high, within a range scored by other groups of delinquents (Martin, 1981, p. 13) (Krausher, 1981).

The sub-scale scores were further analyzed by reforming the delinquency groups as shown by Table 15 in order to increase the size of each group. Again no significant differences were found.

Both Table 14 and 15 indicate that the group scoring the highest of two sub-scales (found to be the best identifiers of delinquency) (Martin, 1981, Cowden et al, 1969, Vallance and Forrest, 1977), was the group that were not adjudicated delinquents.

It appears then, from the Jesness Inventory scores, that in terms of attitudes, this is a fairly homogeneous group. and further, that those "non-delinquent" children had responses to the Jesness Inventory that were at least, if not more characteristic of those adjudicated delinquents in the JI normative sample.

LENGTH OF TIME SINCE FIRST CONTACT WITH ALBERTA SOCIAL SERVICES

The Child Welfare Policy Manual states that children who are

referred to Compulsory Care should have exhausted all other possible resources, in an effort to get the help necessary before a Compulsory Care placement is made. Thirty-six point nine per cent (36.9%) of this population had their first contact with Alberta Social Services within the past year. However, within this group, 8 had 3 placements in that year, 4 had 4 placements and 9 had 5 or more placements. Another 22.1% had their first contact two years earlier (see Table 16), for a cumulative percentage of 59.0%. When comparing this figure with that describing children in all Alberta institutions (Alberta, 1974), it is seen that 75.7% of that group had been "in care" (p. 122) two years or less. It may seem then, that from a comparison of these two percentages, that a larger proportion of those children placed in Compulsory Care have had a lengthy involvement with Alberta Social Services than that group referred for residential (institutional) treatment - as should be the case. However, any conclusions drawn from this comparison can only be done cautiously; figures from this study indicate time since "first contact" - the Alberta, 1974 figures indicate time actually "in care".

ORDERS VS. CERTIFICATES

As noted in Chapter One, there are two methods, authorities or routes through which a child may be confined in the Province of Alberta. One method, by an order, involves a juvenile court hearing; the other, by certificate, involves a decision of child care professionals.

The process of issuing a certificate is intended to deal with

those children requiring treatment who would not normally come to the attention of the police and consequently, the juvenile courts, and possibly a Compulsory Care Order. Certificates, therefore, may be thought to be intended for a different type of child. Questions have been raised suggesting the possibility that the process of issuing either orders or certificates may not involve sufficient safeguards which ensure that all children placed in Compulsory Care could not be treated in some other, less restrictive, placement.

Table 15.1 shows the distribution of certificates and orders throughout each Compulsory Care resource. Twenty-five point eight per cent (25.8%) of the children in this sample were held by the authority of a Compulsory Care Certificate, 74.2% by Order.

These figures are consistent with an earlier study of Compulsory Care (Alberta, July, 1981) which documented 11.8% certificates, 13.4% renewal certificates (total 25,2%) and 73.6% orders.

This study did not distinguish between those cases which were certificates and those which were renewal certificates.

As shown in Table 15.2, girls were much more likely to be dealt with by a certificate than an order. Such figures are consistent with Table 12, which indicates that except for cases of offenses against self and statue, girls are less likely to appear in court than are boys.

In addition, when analyzing the frequencies of orders and certificates by 3 delinquency groups (low, medium, and high delinquency rate) in Table 15.7, we find significant differences in the cells indicating that delinquent children are more likely to be dealt with

by an order than certificate.

Table 15.3 shows the distribution of orders and certificates across 3 groups of Jesness Inventory Scores (low = less than 60, high = 60 - 70, and 71+). Except for the very highest scores, certificates hold the same relative proportion throughout the range of JI scores. Using Chi-Square, it is found that there are no significant differences in the frequencies of the cells in Table 15.3.

Table 15.6 shows the mean scores on all Jesness Inventory sub-scales. Although there are no significant differences in these means in general, the children dealt with by an Order score slightly more "troubled" than those referred through a certificate. One exception is the Immaturity sub-scale. This scale also identified those children who had attempted suicide (see Medical Factors) and may therefore be related to behaviour problems and emotional disturbance which are not expressed in delinquent behaviour.

The means of scores are generally higher than those reported in another study of children institutionalized in Alberta (Krausher, 1981). Krausher used a group of institutionalized Alberta children (n=84), 46% of which were adjudicated delinquent, and found scores generally lower than those reported here (Table 15.4).

MEDICAL FACTORS

Ideally, a survey such of this one would gather medical history information including birth circumstances, health of mother, etc. Once again, as noted in the limitations of the study (p. 9) only that information which was readily available to child care workers could be included in these data.

Only 5.3% of the sample were taking medication for "emotional/ behavioural reasons" at the time they were admitted to the Compulsory Care facility. It is not known whether this figure includes those children who were taking medication for such purposes immediately prior to admission but are taken off such medication once admitted, as is sometimes the case.

A check was carried out to determine if there was any relationship between those children taking medication for emotional/behavioural reasons and those children who had been placed in a hospital setting within their last three placements. There was no indication that those on medication were the same children previously placed in the hospital.

Eleven point three per cent (11.3%) of the sample (n=17) were recorded as taking medication for "physical/medical" reasons (i.e. epilepsy or enuresis). Two of the seventeen children in this group (1.3% of the sample) were recorded as having an epileptic condition. Another six children (4% of the total sample) were described as enuretic.

Nineteen children in this sample (12.6%) had attempted suicide at least once. Another 11.9% were suspected of having tried to commit suicide. The proportion of children who were known to have attempted suicide scored significantly higher (at the .10 level) on the Jesness Inventory Immaturity (IMM) sub-scale ($\bar{X}$ = 65.73) than those who had not attempted suicide ($\bar{X}$ = 56.65).

SCHOOL ACHIEVEMENT AND BEHAVIOUR

In this section, the study attempted to assess not only academic

achievement, but behaviour while at school. Academic achievement was expressed on the questionnaire in terms of grade levels (using a variety of tests) in Math, Reading and Spelling, which has been transformed into grade level below or above expected grade level. Expected grade level was calculated by subtracting 6 (usual age at first grade) from the chronological age (expressed in 10ths of years).

From thirty seven per cent (36.8%) to 48.6% of the sample were performing at or above grade level. Approximately 20% were working four years or more behind (see Table 17).

Each child was rated by child care workers on two school behavior variables (cf Appendix D, p.124). The child care workers' ratings of previous school behaviour as either "withdrawn", "cooperative", "disruptive", or "extremely disruptive" seemed not to explain any academic retardation. These four types of school behaviour were spread evenly across all degrees of academic retardation. Table 18 presents Math grade levels as an example.

WISC-R SCORES

I.Q. scores (WISC-R) were gathered on 109 of the total sample of children. Verbal I.Q. scores ranged from 57 to 135, the mean being 87.98. The range of performance I.Q. was from 60 to 138, with a mean of 102.79. The mean full scale I.Q. was 94.28 (Table 19).

Ten children showed Verbal I.Q. scores of 70 or lower; 2 children had Performance I.Q.'s of less than 70. Forty-six (46) children had Verbal I.Q.'s of less than 85; 11 children had Performance scores of less than 85.

The elevation of performance scores over verbal is consistent with several other studies of delinquent populations (Prentice and Kelly, 1963). However, the difference between performance and verbal means (14.8) is greater than all other studies surveyed that dealt with the P-V discrepancy. Prentice and Kelly (1963) surveyed 24 studies of delinquent or criminal populations which documented a range of P-V differences of from 6-14, the usual discrepancy being 8-10. The difference found here is relatively large.

Rather than enabling the differential diagnosis of delinquency (Weschler, 1949), this elevation is more commonly related to learning difficulties (Graham and Kamano, 1959). Table 20 shows that 33.9% of this sample had a performance score at least 20 points higher than the verbal score. Fourteen point seven per cent had a P-V difference of 31 or more. Although the frequencies in the cells is small, Table 21 lends some support to the thesis that as P-V difference increases in magnitude, chances of grade level retardation in reading increase. The proportion of those with little or no P-V difference in their I.Q. score decreases as grade level retardation increases, and the trend is the opposite for the groups with a large P-V difference. However, one reason this trend (Table 21) is not clearer may have to do with the fact that many of these children have previously received substantial remedial assistance in Special Education facilities connected with previous institutional placements.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Alberta's Compulsory Care legislation and programs represent another interesting and perhaps controversial experiment in the field of the treatment and prevention of delinquency. This study has described a population of 151 children held in Compulsory Care facilities on a single day, in an effort to determine how the legislation is being used and to provide a basis for further investigation into the use and impact of Compulsory Care.

Chapter Two of this thesis has documented the variations in types of care provided to 'problem' children since the middle of the nineteenth century. It was noted that children were variously handled according to predominant philosophies of human nature of the time, and also that plans for care of the children did not often match the actual practices. Within Alberta, the responsibility for these 'problem' children passed from religious groups to civic volunteer societies, to civic government, back to private organizations, and finally, clearly to the provincial government. There has also been confusion as to whether difficult children should be dealt with as behaviorally-disordered, neglected children, or as delinquent children who need to experience appropriate consequences for irresponsible behavior.

The Compulsory Care Amendment to the Child Welfare Act of Alberta came on the heels of a report (Alberta, 1977) which argued for greater emphasis on teaching responsibility to delinquent children; the Province of Alberta Social Services and Community Health

describes the program as a "treatment" program. It is still not clear, then, whether the program is one of detterance or treatment.

In this historical light, the question which this thesis attempted to answer was; who are the children dealt with by this legislation?

Compulsory Care facilities serve a homogeneous group of children in terms of age; 80% falling between 13.6 and 15.5 years, the majority of which are boys (62.3%). Native children are over-represented, when this population is compared to the provincial general population figures. Referrals from the northern part of the province tend to contain a larger proportion of native children than do referrals from the southern regions.

The over-representation of native children in treatment centers (Alberta, 1974) and compulsory care settings, may have come to be accepted by those within the child care field in this province. A thorough examination of the conditions from which these children come needs to be undertaken, as well as, an examination of the nature of the actual experience of the native child when placed in a treatment facility compared to that of the caucasion child. Equally important would be an examination of the outcome of the compulsory care program for native children compared to others. Paterson et al.(1979), for example, with a small sample, found that social workers rated 63.3% of children placed in compulsory care at Westfield as showing "poor" or "very Poor" rehabilitation. Further examination by race, as well as many other variables is necessary. Only some of these questions can be addressed by data gathered by the ongoing Alberta Institutional Information System.

The children in Compulsory Care come from a wide variety of backgrounds and histories. Some have had many placements previously; 10% have never lived anywhere else but in their own home. A majority of the children (62.3%0 come from families which had undergone a major change in structure, or from single-parent families.

None of the program descriptions of Compulsory Care facilities reviewed in this study, included mention of family involvement in the treatment program, nor is it evident that family counseling expertise is included in staff complement of the programs. The data collected here would suggest the great need for family counselling and, or a family support program, especially for those children coming to compulsory care directly from their homes. The need for family intervention is further emphasized by finding here that 52% of this population had older siblings in care at some time earlier than the placement in compulsory care.

This population shows a wide range of degree of delinquent behaviour, from non-delinquent (or apparently so) to severely delinquent. Several different kinds or types of delinquency are shown, i.e. children having offenses against property and those with only offenses against self or statute. It is encouraging to note that several program descriptions mention "individualized" treatment plans, thereby documenting types - a recommendation by Krausher, (1981).

The Jesness Inventory

Jesness Inventory scores were sensitive to several variables. With the on-going use of this test in the Institutional Information System, and thereby the achievement of larger groups of scores to

study, the sensitivity to behaviour patterns other than delinquent behaviour can be studied. Of most interest here was the significant difference in scores on the Immaturity scale between those children who had attempted suicide and those who had not. Further use of this instrument to determine its ability to detect differences across groups of institutionalized children (open and closed), children in day programs, and children in foster care, should be undertaken. Most importantly, the ability of the test to predict post-placement variables should be carefully studied.

Misplaced Children

It can be argued from these data that a small group of children in compulsory care do not fit the description of those for whom the program is intended. This group appears to be those children who had no previous placements. For 10% of this population studied here, no other residential program was tried proir to the compulsory care placement. If those who had only short-term detention placements are also included, it can be said that 14.6% had not been tried in another therapeutic resource first. Those children with fewer or no previous placements tend to score lower on the Jesness Inventory indicating that they are less "troubled" than those with more placements.

It could also be argued that those children who have had no adjudicated delinquencies are also not the "hard-core" child for whom the program is intended.

However, those children with no delinquencies scored higher on the JI (suggesting they are at least as troubled) as those children

who were very delinquent. It may be then, that in the case of the non-delinquent children, social workers and judges are identifying children who do need treatment, but in the case of those children who have had no previous placements, the referring process may not have been selective enough.

In general, it would seem from these data that the children placed in Alberta Compulsory Care settings are very troubled, highly delinquent groups from a wide variety of family backgrounds. In this light, the program is serving those children for whom the legislation intended it.

A small proportion of the children, however, may be misplaced. A closer study of those children who are placed in compulsory care who have not been tried first in other settings, needs to be carried out.

It is recommended on the basis of this information presented here that a single person within the Alberta Social Services and Community Health Department be identified, whose sole primary responsibility it would be to monitor the nature of all children referred to Compulsory Care.

In addition is also recommended that on-going research be conducted, whose purpose it would be to investigate the impact of Compulsory care programs differentially on all types of children placed therein.

Finally, it is recommended that a study be made of the need for, and availability of family counselling or family support services to those children placed in compulsory care.

REFERENCES

Alberta, Department of Health and Social Development, Report on Juvenile Delinquency, Edmonton, 1970.

Alberta, Report of the Alberta Royal Commission on Juvenile Delinquency, February, 1967.

Alberta, Board of Review, Provincial Courts. Report No. 3, 1977.

Alberta Health and Social Development, Study of the Characteristics of Children Admitted to Alberta Child Welfare Institutions, 1969-71, Research and Planning, Edmonton, 1974.

Alberta Social Services and Community Health, Child Welfare Programs, April, 1982

Alberta Social Services and Community Health, Westfield Policy Manual, 1980,

Alberta Social Services and Community Health, Policy Manual: Youth Assessment Center, Fort MacMurray, 1979.

Alberta Social Services and Community Health, Compulsory Care in Alberta: A Study Conducted by the Planning Secretariat in Conjunction with the Child Welfare Branch, Edmonton, 1982.

Barkwell, L.J., Differential Treatment of Juveniles on Probation, An Evaluative Study, Canadian Journal of Criminology and Corrections, 18: 363-378, 1976.

Brenzel, B., Domsetication as Reform: A Study of the Scoialization of Wayward Girls, 1856 - 1905, Harvard Educational Review, 50: 587-598, 1980.

Brooks, C.R., WISC, WISC-R, S-BL&M, WRAT: Relationships and Trends among Children Ages Six to Ten Referred for Psychological Evaluation, Psychology in the Schools, 14: 30-33, 1977

Camp, B.W., WISC performance in Acting-out and Delinquent Children With and Without EEG Abnormality, Journal of Consulting Psychology, 30: 350-353, 1966.

Camp, B.W., Doornick, W. Zimet, S., Dahlem, N.W., Verbal Abilities in Young Aggressive Boys, Journal of Educational Psychology, 69, 129-135, 1977.

Conroy, C., A Study of the First Two Hundred Admissions to the Youth Assessment Center, Fort MacMurray, Unpublished Paper, Fort MacMurray, 1981.

Cowden, J.E., Peterson, M.W., & Pacht, A.R., The MCI versus the Jesness Inventory as a Screening and Classification Instrument at a Juvenile Correction Center, Journal of Clinical Psychology, 25: 57-60, 1969.

Conklin, R.C., & Dockrell, W.B., The Prediction, Validity and Stability of WISC scores Over a Four Year Period, Psychology in the Schools, 4: 263-266, 1967.

Fernald, P.S. & Wisser, F., Using the WISC Verbal-Performance Discrepancy to Predict Degree of Acting-out, Journal of Clinical Psychology, 23: 92-93, 1967.

Fisher, Robert M., Acquiescent Response Set, The Jesness Inventory, and Implications for the Use of 'Foreign' Psychological Tests, British Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology, 6: 1-10, 1967.

Fraas, Louis A., & Price, R.L., The Jesness Inventory as a Predictor of AWOL Recidivism, Psychological Reports, 31: 741-742, 1972.

Gibbons, Don, Delinquent Behavior, Prentice-Hall, Englewood Cliffs, N.J., 1970.

Government of the Province of Alberta, The Child Welfare Act, Queen's Printer, Edmonton.

Guertin, W.H., Ladd, C.E., Frank, G.A., Rabin, A.I. & Hiester, D.S., Research with the Weschler Intelligence Scales for Adults, 1960-65, Psychological Bulletin, 66: 385-409, 1966.

Hackler, J., The Prevention of Youthful Crime: The Great Stumble Forward, Metheun Publication, New York, 1978.

Hagan, J. & Leon, J., Rediscovering Delinquency and Social History, Political Ideology and the Sociology of Law, American Sociological Review, 42: 587-598, 1977.

Hartlage, L.C., & Steele, C.T., WISC and WISC-R Correlates of Academic Achievement, Psychology in the Schools, 14: 15-18, 1977.

Haynes, J. P. and Bensch, Marlene, The P V Sign on the WISC-R and Recidivism in Delinquents, Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 1981, 49, 480-481.

Hays, J.R., Solway, K. S., Schreiner, D., Intellectual Characteristics of Juvenile Murderers versus Status Offenders, Psychology Reports, 1978, 43, 80-82.

Jenkin, N., Spivack, G., Levine, M., and Savage, W., Weschler Profiles and Academic Achievement on Emotionally Disturbed Boys, Journal of Consulting Psychology, 1964, 28, 290.

Jesness, C.F., The Jesness Inventory, Consulting Psychologists Press, Palo Alto, 1972.

Jesness, C.F., The Preston Typology Study: An Experiment With Differential Treatment in an Institution, Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency, 8, 1971, 38-52.

Jesness, C.F., Comparative Effectiveness of Behaviour Modification and Transactional Analysis Program for Delinquents, Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 1975, 43, 758-779.

Jesness, Carl F., Manual for Youth Counsellors, California Youth Authority Division of Research, Sacramento, California, 1979.

Jessor, R., and Jessor, S.L., Problem Behaviour and Psychosocial Development, A Longitudinal Study of Youth, Academic Press, New York, 1977.

Kelly, F.J. and Baer, D.J., Jesness Inventory and Self-concept Measures for Delinquents Before and After Participation in Outward Bound, Psychological Reports, 25, 1969, 719-724.

Krausher, R., Interrelationships Among Propositional Logic, Social Perspective-Taking, Moral Stage and Delinquent I-Level Classification, Ph. D. Thesis, University of Alberta, Edmonton, 1980.

Krewski, Bernie, The Alberta Department of Social Services and Community Health: A History, Unpublished Paper, Edmonton, 1979.

Littell, M.W., The Weschler Intelligence Scale for Children: Review of a Decade of Research, Psychological Bulletin, 57: 132-155, 1960.

Martin, R.D., Cross-Validation of the Jesness Inventory With Delinquents and Non-delinquents, Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 49: 10-14, 1981.

Martin, D. & Clarke, R.V.G., The Personality of Approved School bsconders, British Journal of Criminology, 9: 366-375, 1969.

Mayer, R.W., A Study of the STEP reading, SCAT and WISC Tests and School Grades, Reading Teacher, 12:117-142, 1958.

McCord, Joan, Some Child-Rearing Antecedents of Criminal Behavior in Adult Men, Journal ofPersonality and Social Psychology, 37: 1477-1486, 1979.

Meen, D., & Chubb, R., Development Document: Child Welfare Services in Alberta: A History, Grant MacEwan Community College, Edmonton, 1981.

Nelson, Jean C., Supplementary Report on Juvenile Delinquency in Alberta, Government of Alberta, Edmonton, February, 1967.

Paterson, John G. & Frauenfeld, A., A Follow-up of Children Placed in Compulsory Care, Westfield, Unpublished Paper, Edmonton, 1980.

Platt, A., The Child-Savers; The Invention of Delinquency, The University of Chicago Press, London, 1969.

Polsky, Howard, Cottage Six- The Social System of Delinquent Boys in Residential Treatment, Robert E. Kreuger Publishing Co., New York, 1962.

Prentice, N.M., & Kelly, F.J., Intelligence and Delinquency: A Reconsideration, The Journal of Social Psychology, 60: 327-337, 1963.

Radzinowicz, Leon & Turner, J.C.W., A Study of Punishment, Canadian Bar Review, 21, 91-97, 1943.

Robins, Lee N., Deviant Children Grow Up, Williams and Wilkins Co., Baltimaore, 1966.

Russell, A., Personal Communication, June, 1982

Rutter, M. & Lockyer, L., A Five to Fifteen Year Follow-up Study of Infantile Psychosis: I Description of Sample, British Journal of Psychiatry, 113: 1169-1182, 1967.

Schlossman, S.L., Love and the American Delinquent, University of Chicago Press, London, 1977

Schlossman, S.L. & Wallach, S., The Crime of Female Precocious Sexuality; Female Juvenile Delinquency in the Progressive Era, Harvard Educational Review, 48: 65-94, 1978.

Shark, M.L., & Handal, P.J., Reliability and Validity of the Jesness Inventory: A Caution, Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 45: 692-695, 1977.

Smith, D., Relationships Between the Eysenck and The Jesness personality Inventories, British Journal of Criminology, 14: 375-384, 1975.

Solway, K.S., Hays, J.R., Roberts, T.K. & Cody, J.A., Comparison of WISC Profiles of Alleged Juvenile Delinquents Living at Home Versus Those Incarcerated, Psychological Reports, 37: 403-407, 1975.

Sundean, D.A. & Salopek, T.F., Achievement and Intelligence in Primary and Elementary Classes for the Educable Mentally Retarded, Journal of School Psychology, 9: 150-155, 1971

Vallance, R.C. & Forrest, A.R., A Study of the Jesness Personality Inventory With Scottish Children, British Journal of Educational Psychology, 41, 338-344, 1977.

Vernon, P., Intelligence and Cultural Environment, Methuen, London, 1969.

Welfare in Alberta: The Report of a Study Undertaken by the Imperial Order of the Daughters of the Empire, Alberta Provincial Chapter, 1947, Alberta Provincial Archives, Alberta, 77-248.

Werner, Eric, Psychological and Ethnic Correlates of Interpersonal Maturity Among Delinquents, British Journal of Criminology, 15: 51-67, 1975.

Weschler, D., The Weschler Intelligence Scale for Children Psychological Corporatio, New York, 1949.

Weschler, D, The Weschler Intelligence Scale for Children - Revised, Psychological Corporation, New York, 1974.

Blank page inserted for page 66

APPENDIX "A"

Table 1

Number of Children in Each Compulsory Care Setting

	No.	%
William Roper Hull Home, Calgary	3	2.0
Youth Development Center, Edmonton	31	20.5
Westfield, Edmlnton	6	4.0
Youth Assessment Center, Fort MacMurray	14	9.3
Youth Assessment Center, High Prairie	12	7.9
Youth Assessment Center, Lac La Biche	6	4.0
Youth Assessment Center, Grande Prairie	14	9.3
Youth Assessment Center, Red Deer	10	6.6
Sifton Children's Center, Lethbridge	6	4.0
Youth Assessment Center, Medicine Hat	3	2.0
Calgary Children's Center, Calgary	29	19.2
Enviros Wildreness Program, Calgary	17	11.3
TOTALS	151	100.0

Table 2

Age Range Within Each Compulsory Care Setting

AGE	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	TOTAL
1. Roper Hull Home, Calgary	0	1	0	0	2	0	0	3
2. Youth Dev. Center, Edmonton	0	0	1	6	22	1	1	31
3. Westfield Edmonton	3	0	1	1	0	1	0	6
4. Y.A.C. Ft. MacMurray	1	0	2	5	5	1	0	14
5. Y.A.C. High Prairie	0	0	2	4	5	1	0	12
6. Y.A.C. Lac La Biche	0	0	0	1	5	0	0	6
7. Y.A.C. Grande Prairie	0	2	1	3	8	0	0	14
8. Y.A.C. Red Deer	0	0	1	2	7	0	0	10
9. Sifton Center Lethbridge	0	1	0	1	3	1	0	6
10. Y.A.C. Medicine Hat	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	3
11. Children,s Center, Calgary	0	0	3	8	15	3	0	29
12. Enviros, Calgary	0	0	0	1	15	1	0	17
TOTAL	4	4	11	32	90	9	1	151

TABLE 3

Sex of Child by Region Making Referral

	North West	North East	Edm.	Cen.	Calgary	South	Missing	TOTAL
Male	19	4	22	14	22	12	1	94
Female	6	5	21	7	15	2	1	57
TOTAL	25	9	43	21	37	14	2	151

TABLE 4

Race of Child by Region Making Referral

	North West	North East	Edm.	Cen.	Calgary	South	Missing	TOTAL
Caucasion	12	4	24	16	30	10	1	97
	48%	44%	55%	76%	81%	71%		
Treaty, Non-treaty, Metis	18	4	17	5	5	3	2	49
	52%	44%	43%	24%	13%	21%		
Other	0	1	2	0	2	0	0	5
		11%	2%		5%			
TOTAL	25	9	43	21	37	14	3	151

TABLE 4.1

Agency By Region Making Referral

AGENCY	North West	North East	Edm.	Cen.	Calgary	South	Miss.
1. Roper Hull Home Calgary	0	0	0	2	1	0	0
2. Youth Development Centre, Edmonton	3	2	17	1	6	1	1
3. Westfield Edmonton	1	0	4	0	0	0	1
4. YAC Ft. McMurray	0	7	7	0	0	0	0
5. YAC High Prairie	5	0	7	0	0	0	0
6. YAC Lac La Biche	0	0	6	0	0	0	0
7. YAC Grande Prairie	13	0	1	0	0	0	0
8. YAC Red Deer	0	0	1	9	0	0	0
9. Sifton Children's Centre, Lethbridge	0	0	0	1	0	5	0
10. YAC Medicine Hat	0	0	0	0	0	3	0
11. Calgary Children's Centre, Calgary	0	0	0	2	25	2	0
12. Enviros Calgary	3	0	0	6	5	3	0

TABLE 5

Total Previous Placements by Race

	Cauc.	Other	TOTAL	%	Cum.%
0	15	1	16	10.7	10.7
1	12	8	20	13.3	24.0
2	17	7	24	16.0	40.0
3	13	6	19	12.7	52.7
4	12	6	18	12.0	64.7
5	5	3	8	5.3	70.0
6-10	12	11	23	15.3	85.3
11+	11	11	22	13.9	99.3
Miss.	0	1	1	.7	100.0
TOTAL	97	54	151	100.0	

TABLE 5.1

TOTAL PREVIOUS PLACEMENTS BY JESNESS SCORES

	NO. OF PREVIOUS PLACEMENTS	0	1	2	3-4	5-10	11+
Jesness Inventory Scores	SM	61.0	65.0	65.1	67.9	70.2	66.0
	VO	55.0	57.4	58.1	58.2	60.9	57.6
	IMM	57.4	58.0	51.7	61.0	61.3	56.8
	AU	60.3	65.6	61.1	61.1	65.0	61.8
	AL	59.4	60.9	59.4	61.5	61.5	61.2
	MA	50.1	55.9	59.0	56.0	58.5	54.7
	WD	47.0	57.0	57.0	52.5	54.8	49.1
	SA	43.3	50.4	50.4	45.7	48.0	42.2
	REP	52.1	50.0	50.0	53.6	51.8	52.1
	DEN	47.6	41.2	41.2	46.9	42.8	45.9
	AI	62.9	67.7	67.7	65.7	70.6	66.0

TABLE 6

Characteristics of Current Family Group by Race

	Cauc.	Treaty	Non-treaty	Metis	Other	TOTAL
Single Mother	21	4	2	12	1	40
Mother re-married	20	1	1	2	0	24
Parents together	30	3	0	3	1	37
Nat. Mother C/L Father	8	1	1	4	0	14
Foster	2	1	0	0	1	4
Single Father	2	2	0	1	0	5
Father re-married	2	1	0	0	0	3
Nat. Father C/L Mother	4	0	0	0	0	4
Other	8	5	2	3	2	20
TOTAL	97	18	6	25	5	151

TABLE 7

Characteristics of Family, 1st, 2nd, and 3rd Choices Made by Child Care Workers

	Most Important	2nd Most Important	Least Important
No Problem	1	20	84
Child Problem	73	42	20
Parent Problem	53	43	8
Parent-Child Interaction	22	42	23
missing	2	4	16
Total	151	151	151

TABLE 8

FAMILY SIZE BY RACE

	0 Sibs	1 Sib	2 Sibs	3 Sibs	4 Sibs	5 Sibs	6 Sibs	7+ Sibs	Missing	TOTAL
Caucasian	3	27	25	19	9	7	1	3	3	97
Treaty	0	2	2	6	4	0	0	4	0	18
Non-Treaty	2	1	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	6
Metis	1	5	2	3	2	1	5	5	1	25
Other	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	2	5
TOTAL	6	36	30	31	16	8	6	12	6	151

TABLE 9

	NUMBER	PER CENT
Full Income Security	22	17.6
Social Allowance Supplement	24	19.2
Indian Affairs Supplement	2	1.6
Employed Full Time	68	54.4
Other	3	2.4
Casual Employment	6	4.8
Missing	26	
TOTAL	151	100%

TABLE 10

Income Source By Race

	Cauc.	Treaty	Non-T	Metis	Other	TOTAL
Full Income Security	13	3	0	5	1	22
Partial Assistance	8	5	1	11	1	26
Employed Full Time	60	2	3	5	1	71
Casual Employment	3	0	2	1	0	6
TOTALS	84	10	6	22	3	125

TABLE 11

Involvement of Other Siblings With Alberta Social Services

Sibs Involved With Department	Frequency	%
0	70	52.2
1	27	20.1
2	20	14.9
3	10	7.5
4	4	3.0
5	1	.7
6	1	.7
7	1	.7
8	1	.7
Missing	11	7.5
TOTALS	146	100.0

TABLE 12

Delinquencies By Sex

		Male	Female	TOTAL	%
0	No Delinquencies	6	9	15	9.9
1	Low Frequency - statute offenses only	8	3	11	7.3
2	Low Frequency - property offenses	13	10	23	15.2
3	High Frequency - statute offenses	6	10	16	10.6
4	Offenses against self	3	12	15	9.9
5	High Frequency - property offenses	49	9	58	38.4
6	High Frequency - property and persons offenses	9	3	12	7.9
7	High Frequency - all types	0	1	1	0.7
	TOTALS	94	37	151	

TABLE 13

Delinquency By Race

	Caucasian	Other	TOTAL
No Delinquencies	9	6	15
Low Frequency - statute offenses only	7	4	11
Low Frequency - property offenses	17	6	23
High Frequency - statute offenses	11	5	16
Offenses against self	9	6	15
High Frequency - property offenses	39	19	58
High Frequency - property and persons offenses	5	7	12
High Frequency - all types	0	1	1
TOTALS	97	42	139

TABLE 14

Delinquency Groups By Jesness Inventory (Standard Score) Means (N=86)

		SM	VO	IMM	AU	AL	MA	WD	SA	REP	DEN	AI
0	No Delinquencies	68.3	55.8	62.1	61.0	59.4	60.2	51.7	47.5	52.7	45.7	69.6
1	Low Frequency - statute offenses only	67.0	57.4	54.5	63.2	58.5	56.5	55.7	43.9	50.7	45.4	69.7
2	Low Frequency - property offenses	66.9	58.7	61.6	59.3	60.6	56.2	49.1	48.3	51.3	45.5	67.3
3	High Frequency - statute offenses	61.5	55.7	53.5	58.2	58.2	55.5	61.7	47.3	45.8	41.3	64.2
4	Offenses against self	62.3	57.3	56.9	62.8	62.4	54.1	49.3	46.7	51.3	45.4	60.7
5	High Frequency - property offenses	66.9	59.3	57.6	63.7	61.6	54.6	52.5	44.8	54.2	44.9	65.4
6	High Frequency - property and persons offenses	68.3	59.0	56.5	64.8	61.5	55.8	49.2	42.6	51.5	44.4	68.5
	TOTAL	66.5	58.1	58.2	62.2	60.6	56.0	52.2	45.8	52.1	44.9	66.5

TABLE 15

Delinquency Types By Jesness Inventory (Standard) Scores (N=86)

	SM	VO	IMM	AU	AL	MA	WD	SA	REP	DEN	AI
(1) No Delinquency or low frequency statute offenses n=20	67.8	56.4	59.0	61.9	59.0	58.7	53.3	46.0	51.9	45.6	69.6
(2) Low Frequency property or high statute offenses n=20	65.3	57.8	59.2	58.9	59.8	56.0	52.9	48.0	49.6	44.2	66.3
(3) Offenses against self or high property offenses or high frequency persons/property offenses n=46	66.4	58.9	57.3	63.7	61.7	54.8	51.4	44.7	53.3	44.9	65.2

TABLE 15.1

Certificates/Orders By Agency

	Cert.	Order	Total
William Roper Hull Home, Calgary	3	0	3
Youth Development Centre, Edmonton	9	22	31
Westfield, Edmonton	4	2	6
YAC, Ft. McMurray	6	8	14
YAC, High Prairie	5	7	12
YAC, Lac La Biche	1	5	6
YAC, Grande Prairie	2	12	14
YAC, Red Deer	4	6	10
YAC, Lethbridge	0	6	6
Enviros, Calgary	2	15	17
Children's Centre, Calgary	3	26	29
TOTALS	39	112	151

TABLE 15.2

Orders/Certificates By Sex

	CERT.	ORDER	TOTAL
Males	16	78	94
Females	23	34	57
TOTALS	39	112	151

Chi Square = 8.900

Level of Significance= .003

TABLE 15.3

Grouped JI Scores (SM, VO, MA) By Certificate/Order

		CERT.	ORDER	TOTAL	%
Group 1 (≤60)	SM	7	15	22	25.6
	VO	14	34	48	55.8
	MA	12	44	56	65.1
Group 2 (61-70)	SM	11	23	34	39.5
	VO	9	22	31	36.0
	MA	9	14	23	26.7
Group 3 (≥70)	SM	6	24	30	34.9
	VO	1	6	7	8.1
	MA	3	4	7	8.1

TABLE 15.4

Grouped JI Scores (SM, VO, MA) By Total Placements

		Total Placements					
		0 or 1	2-4	5-10	11+	TOTAL	%
Group 1	SM	6	10	3	3	22	25.6
(< 60)	VO	8	22	7	11	48	55.8
	MA	13	22	10	12	56	65.1
Group 2	SM	7	13	4	10	34	39.5
(61-70)	VO	9	10	8	4	31	36.0
	MA	4	11	4	4	23	26.7
Group 3	SM	4	12	10	4	30	34.9
(> 70)	VO	0	3	2	2	7	8.1
	MA	0	3	3	1	7	8.1

TABLE 15.5

COMPARISON OF JESNESS MEANS OF ALBERTA COMPULSORY CARE GROUP (1982) AND OTHER INSTITUTIONALIZED DELINQUENT GROUPS (KRAUSHER, 1981)

	Compulsory Care (N=86)	Institutionalized Open and Closed (N=84)
SM	66,5	60.1
VO	58.1	52.3
IMM	58.2	54.7
AU	62.2	55.8
AL	60.6	54.1
MA	56.0	51.7
WD	52.2	52.4
SA	45.8	49.8
REP	52.1	52.6
DEN	44.9	48.1
A.I.	66.5	60.1

TABLE 15.6

JESNESS SCORES OF CHILDREN REFERRED BY ORDER AND BY CERTIFICATE

	Orders (N=62)	Certificates (N=24)
SM	67.1	64.8
VO	59.0	55.7
IMM	56.9	61.5
AU	63.0	60.0
AL	61.2	59.3
MA	55.6	56.9
WD	52.3	51.2
SA	46.1	45.0
REP	32.5	51.2
DEN	45.4	43.6
AI	66.3	67.0

Table 15.7

Delinquency Groups (Low, Medium, High)
by Certificates/Orders

	CERT.	ORDER	TOTAL
GROUP 1 No deliquency, or low frequency statute offenses	14	12	26
GROUP 2 low property offenses, or high statute	13	26	39
GROUP 3 offenses against self, or high freq. property, or high freq. persons/ property offenses	12	74	86
TOTAL	39	112	151

Chi Square 18.131

Level of Significance .0001

TABLE 16

Years Since First Contact With Alberta Social Services

Within	Number	%	Cum %
1 Year	55	36.9	36.9
2 Years	33	22.1	59.1
3 Years	26	17.4	76.5
4 Years	11	7.4	83.9
5 Years	8	5.4	89.3
6 Years	4	2.7	91.9
7 Years	4	2.7	94.6
8+ Years	10	5.6	100.0

TABLE 17

Academic Grade Levels in Math, Reading, Spelling

	Math		Reading		Spelling	
At or above grade level	49	36.8%	67	48.6%	61	44.2%
1 year below grade level	19	14.3%	27	19.6%	18	13.0%
2 years below grade level	24	18.0%	12	8.7%	23	16.7%
3 years below grade level	15	11.3%	14	10.1%	9	6.5%
4 years below grade level	23	17.3%	14	10.1%	20	14.5%
5+ years below grade level	3	2.4%	1	0.7%	7	4.9%
TOTAL	138	100%	138	100%	138	100%

TABLE 18

Math Grade Level - By School Behavior

	Withdrawn	Cooperative	Disruptive	Extremely Disruptive	Other	TOTAL	
At or above grade level	6	14	15	14	0	37%	
1 year behind grade level	2	3	7	7	0	14%	
2 years behind grade level	6	4	7	7	0	18%	
3 years behind grade level	3	2	5	4	1	11%	
4 years behind grade level	7	6	6	4	0	17%	
5+ years behind grade level	2	0	1	0	0	1.6%	
TOTALS	26	29	41	36	1		133

TABLE 19

Mean WISC-R Scores

	N	$\bar{X}$	S.D
Information	98	7.224	2.805
Similarities	98	8.418	2.528
Arithmatic	96	8.667	2.586
Vocabulary	98	7.418	2.445
Comprehension	97	8.536	2.570
Digit Span	73	8.260	3.249
Picture Completion	99	10.707	2.793
Picture Arrangement	99	10.869	2.465
Block Design	95	10.421	2.762
Object Assembly	96	11.604	3.417
Coding	95	8.947	3.140
Verbal	107	87.981	13.366
Performance	107	102.794	14.432
Full Scale	107	94.280	12.389

TABLE 20

Frequency of Performance - Verbal I.Q. Differences

Performance-Verbal I.Q. Difference	Frequency	%
0 - 15 or V ≥ P	56	51.4
16 - 20	16	14.7
21 - 25	14	12.8
26 - 30	7	6.4
31 - 50	16	14.7
TOTAL	109	100.0

TABLE 21

Performance - Verbal I.Q. Difference By Grade Level Retardation in Reading

Performance-Verbal I.Q. Difference	0-20	21-25	26+	Total
A+ or above grade level (reading)	36	3	9	48
1-2 grades behind (reading)	19	5	6	30
3+ grades behind (reading)	17	6	8	31
TOTAL	72	14	23	119

APPENDIX "B"

Alberta

SOCIAL SERVICES
AND COMMUNITY HEALTH

SUPPORTING AFFIDAVIT

CHILD WELFARE BRANCH

IN THE MATTER OF .....
(FULL NAME OF CHILD)

BORN ..... A.D., 19 ..... A CHILD AND A WARD

OF THE CROWN.

1. I HAVE PERSONAL KNOWLEDGE OF THE CHILD NAMED HEREIN.

2. IN MY OPINION THE CHILD IS:

   a) SUFFERING FROM AN EMOTIONAL OR BEHAVIORAL DISTURBANCE, AND

   b) IS IN A CONDITION PRESENTING A DANGER TO HIMSELF OR OTHERS OR IS OTHERWISE OUT OF CONTROL

BRIEFLY, MY REASONS FOR COMING TO THIS CONCLUSION ARE:

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

PLEASE ATTACH COPIES OF YOUR ASSESSMENT (S) WHICH HAVE LED YOU TO SIGN THIS STATEMENT.)

PRINT NAME: .....

PROFESSION
AND
QUALIFICATIONS: .....

SIGNATURE: .....

SIGNED BEFORE ME IN THE

..... OF .....

IN THE PROVINCE OF ALBERTA,

THIS ..... DAY OF .....

A.D., 19 .....

SIGNATURE .....

.....
COMMISSIONER FOR OATHS IN AND FOR THE PROVINCE OF

SCH 488 (11/81)

COURT FILE #

ASSCH FILE #

THE JUVENILE DIVISION OF
THE PROVINCIAL COURT
OF ALBERTA

APPLICATION FOR HEARING

RE: _____

INSERT EITHER
"COMPULSORY CARE CERTIFICATE"
OR
"COMPULSORY CARE ORDER"

I DO HEREBY REQUEST THAT THE _____

DATED THE _____ DAY OF _____ A.D. 19 _____

BE REVIEWED PURSUANT TO THE PROVISIONS OF THE JUVENILE DELINQUENT ACT/CHILD WELFARE ACT FOR THE FOLLOWING REASONS:

_____
SIGNED

_____
OCCUPATION OR RELATIONSHIP
TO THE JUVENILE

_____
ADDRESS

APPENDIX C

VARIABLE LIST

1. Agency
2. Sex
3. Age
4. Race
5. Legal Status of Child
6. Additional Status
7. Certificate/Order
8. Region Making Referral
9. Reason for Referral
10. Total Placements Outside Family
11. Most Recent Placement
12. Duration of Most Recent Placement
13. 2nd Last Placement
14. 3rd Last Placement
15. No. of Social Workers Assigned To Child
16. Family Size
17. Mother Figure
18. Father Figure
19. Family Characteristics Preventing Placement at Home, 1st choice
20. Family Characteristics Preventing Placement at Home, 2nd choice
21. Family Characteristics Preventing Placement at Home, 3rd choice
22. Adoption
23. Income Source
24. Months Since Child Lived With Family
25. Other Sibs In Care
26. Years Since First Contact With Department
27. Delinquency Crimes Against Persons
28. Delinquency Crimes Against Property
29. Delinquency Crimes Against Self
30. Delinquency Crimes Against Statute
31. Medication
32. Epilepsy
33. Enuresis
34. Suicide
35. Last Grade in Community School
36. School Attendance Prior to CC
37. School Behavior
38. School Board
39. SM (Social Maladjustment
40. VO (Value Orientation)
41. IMM (Immaturity)
42. AUT (Autism)
43. AL (Alienation)
44. MA (Manifest Aggression)
45. WD (Withdrawal)
46. SA (Social Anxiety)
47. REP (Repression)
48. DEN (Denial)
49. AI (Asocial Index)

J.I.Scores

50. Information
51. Similarities
52. Arithmatic
53. Vocabulary
54. Comprehension
55. Digit Span
56. Picture Completion
57. Picture Arrangement
58. Block Design
59. Object Assembly
60. Coding
61. Verbal I.Q.
62. Performance I.Q.
63. Full Scale I.Q.

WISC-R Scores

64. P-V Difference
65. Math Grade Level, + or -
66. Math Grade Level
67. Reading Grade Level, + or -
68. Reading Grade Level
69. Spelling Grade Level, + or -
70. Spelling Grade Level

APPENDIX D

ALBERTA INSTITUTIONAL INFORMATION SYSTEM

APRIL 1982

INDEX

		Page Number
PART 1 -	INTRODUCTION	
	1. Objectives	3
	2. Description and Scope	4
	3. Explanation of Forms	5
	4. Collection of Data	6
	5. Reports	6
PART 2 -	FORM COMPLETION	
	1. Intake Data Form	9
	1.1 - Background Information	9
	1.2 - Family Information	15
	1.3 - Test Information	23
	2. Discharge/Transfer Data Form	26
	3. Follow-up Data Forms	32
PART 3 -	APPENDICES	
	A. Internal Programs	37
	B. District Office Codes	38
	C. Data Forms	40
PART 4 -	GLOSSARY	41

PART 1

INTRODUCTION

1. OBJECTIVES

The Alberta Institutional Information System is a computer based data system for the collection and analysis of information about children in care in the province of Alberta.

The basis for its use arose from an increasing need for improved methods of collecting and maintaining up-to-date information of those children so that they do not become "lost" in the present system, or decisions about them prolonged through incomplete or difficult-to-obtain file information.

One important feature of the system will be the rapid accessibility to staff members of pertinent information concerning any youth. The system will also allow for the monitoring of individual cases over a given time period, while simultaneously ensuring the confidentiality of the material.

Experience derived from at least one child care centre indicates that where proper data collection and analysis exist, the decision-making capabilities of staff are greatly improved. This is particularly so when the data includes follow-up information in regards to previous placements. A major benefit of the system will, therefore, be the provision of information to staff for the purposes of more effective treatment planning.

Finally, the system will be able to create a more accurate picture of children in care. Based upon the systematic collection and sorting of key variables related to hundreds of children in institutions, a greater understanding of behaviour and treatment may be facilitated.

2. DESCRIPTION AND SCOPE

The Institutional Information System was developed in 1981 by a committee of institutional directors. It was modelled upon, and expanded from, the system currently being used at the Fort McMurray Youth Assessment Centre. The system will be province-wide in application. Although it will initially pertain specifically to the characteristics of youth in child care institutions and group homes, the system will eventually be incorporated into the much larger Child Welfare System.

The information to be collected includes a description of the child's characteristics, his family's characteristics, the child's placement and delinquent history, decisions and recommendations made upon previous discharges, and follow-up information.

The system operates in the following manner. Information is collected by child care staff on each youth admitted to an institution. This information is translated into codes and recorded on data sheets. It is then keypunched into the main computer where it is stored indefinitely. The computer sorts, analyses, correlates and compares any variables of interest to researchers or staff. These results are then translated into reports. The system will also readily access any

information required on an individual basis.

There are presently thirteen child care institutions in the province using the system and it is estimated that it will accommodate approximately 1700 youth within the first year of operation.

Longer term implications may involve immediate access to this information through computer terminals in each agency. An obvious benefit of this would be a reduction of time and paper work in the formulation of casework decisions.

3. EXPLANATION OF FORMS

The system utilizes three forms:

1) intake data form
2) discharge/transfer data form
3) follow-up data forms

The intake data form is the longest and contains background, family and test information. A large part of this information remains relatively static and may be obtained directly from the social worker or skeleton file. Test information may or may not be obtained while the child is in care. Data input sheets should be completed as soon as the information becomes available.

The discharge/transfer form should be filled out when a child is either discharged from the institution to the community, or transferred to another institution or program. This information refers to the characteristics of the child while in care, along with the agency's recommendations. The intake and discharge forms are forwarded to the

child's next placement if transferred to another institution.

Follow-up forms are completed at 3 months, 6 months, 1 year and 2 years. Placement, charge and academic/vocational status is recorded, and "special needs" at three months only. This information will be directly available from the Child Welfare Information System, and special needs, by contacting the social worker.

The manual contains a detailed description of how to fill in each form, which is simply a matter of substituting codes for particulars of information.

4. COLLECTION OF DATA

Each agency will have a "key person" responsible for collecting completed data forms. On a pre-arranged basis, they are then submitted for analysis. The information is summarized, analysed and returned to the agency. Contact person for this procedure:

Joanne Loughlin
Child Welfare Branch
Social Services and Community Health
107th Street Plaza
Edmonton

5. REPORTS

On a regular basis (e.g. every 6 months), an analysis of each agency's data is provided which may then be summarized into a report format. This information is based upon the previous number of children admitted, discharged and followed-up.

The computer separates those children admitted for the first time from those admitted for the second or subsequent time, and also from those in residential versus non-residential programs. Each agency has the option of being provided with any combination of reports depending upon the needs and areas of interest to that agency.

In addition, an annual report summarizing the information for the entire province will be prepared.

PART 2 - FORM COMPLETION

1. INTAKE DATA FORM

1.1 BACKGROUND INFORMATION

(LINE 1)

1.010 Agency Number

The first two digits of this 7 digit field refer to the child's present placement from the following list:

01 - Roper Hull
02 - Y.D.C.
03 - Westfield
04 - Y.A.C., Fort McMurray
05 - Y.A.C., High Prairie
06 - Y.A.C., Lac La Biche
07 - Y.A.C., Grande Prairie
08 - Y.A.C., Red Deer
09 - Sifton Children's Centre, Lethbridge
10 - Y.A.C., Medicine Hat
11 - Calgary Children's Centre
12 - Enviros
13 - Edmonton Detention Receiving Centre
14 -
15 -
16 -

e.g. 1014| | | | | |

Agency-assigned child number

The next four digits refer to the agency file number assigned upon the child's first admission to that agency.

e.g. 1014|0112|18| |

The last digit refers to the total number of admissions of the child to the particular agency.

(e.g. If this is the child's second admission, indicate 2)

|0|4|0|1|2|8|2|

1.040 Line Number

One digit refers to the first line containing the following intake information, Indicate "1".

1.050 S.S.C.H. File Number

The first 6 digits refer to the family SSCH file number.

Sex

Indicate: B - Boy
G - Girl

Child

The last two digits are the unique identifiers of the child within the family.

The entire SSCH file number may be obtained directly from the skeleton file information slip.

1.080 Date of Birth

Six digits are used to indicate year, month and day of the child's birthdate.

1.085 Date of Admission

Six digits refer to the year, month and day of admission to the present placement.

1.090 Agency Program

Three digits are used to indicate any internal program the child is currently involved in (e.g. life skills, community school, etc.) from Appendix "A". This code will be developed by the individual agencies according to their type and number of programs.

1.095 Racial Origin

Enter the code which appears to most closely represent the child's racial origin.

Indicate:
1 - Caucasian
2 - Treaty Indian
3 - Non-treaty Indian
4 - Metis
5 - Black
6 - Oriental
7 - East Indian
8 - Eskimo
9 - Other

Note: If racial origin is mixed, e.g. Oriental and Caucasian, indicate 'other'.

1.100 Primary Departmental Status/State

One digit is used to indicate the child's primary status at the time of admission.

0 - Status yet to be established
1 - Apprehension
2 - Custody by agreement (C.B.A.)
3 - Handicapped Children Services (H.C.S.)
4 - Family Support
5 - Probation Only
6 - Permanent Ward
7 - Supervision Order
8 - TW (JDA)
9 - TW (CWA)

1.110 Additional Status/State

One digit identifies any additional status.

0 - No additional status/state
1 - Adjournment
2 - On Appeal/Under Review
3 - Out of Province Ward
4 - TW (JDA)
5 - PW (JDA)
6 - Probation (additional to primary status)
7 - Repatriation

1.120 Type of Service

This refers to the present placement. (Note: If agency is designated compulsory care, either 4 or 5 must be indicated.)

1 - Non-residential (Day Program, Community Service)
2 - Open Institution
3 - Group Home
4 - Compulsory Care Certificate
5 - Compulsory Care Order
6 - Arrest
7 - Remand

1.130 District Office Responsible

A two digit code indicates the district office that has the client file at the time of admission.
(From Appendix "B")

1.140 Reason for Referral

Enter the two digit code which most closely approximates the major reason for referral.

01 - Physical neglect
02 - Emotional neglect
03 - Abuse
04 - Abandonment
05 - Unwilling or unable to care
06 - Failure to provide medical care
07 - Handicapped child
08 - Emotionally disturbed child
09 - Physically or mentally ill parents
10 - Marital Conflict
11 - Alcohol or drug problem of parent
12 - Alcohol or drug problem of child
13 - Parent/Child conflict
14 - Juvenile Offence
15 - Child/School conflict
16 - Financial problems or mismanagement
17 - Administrative
18 - Wishing to surrender
19 - Other
20 - Physical Abuse
21 - Sexual Abuse
22 - Parent/Guardian deceased
23 - Inadequate Supervision

1.145 Total Number of Placements outside Family

Two digits refer to the total number of times the child has been placed outside the family. Do not include the present placement.

1.150 Most Recent Prior Placement

The first two digits indicate the child's most recent placement prior to coming into your care.

01 - Parents or extended family
02 - Receiving home or facility
03 - Foster home
04 - Group home
05 - Open residential
06 - closed care or wilderness program
07 - Detention
08 - Hospital
09 - AWOL (in excess of 1 month)

The 3rd and 4th digits refer to the number of months in that placement. 01 - 1 month or less
02 - 2 months
99 - 8 years or more

1.160 Previous Placement History

Beginning with the most recent, list up to three types of prior placements the child has had from the following list. Do not include present placement.

If there are less than 3 prior placements, indicate zeros in the last columns.

Please indicate all three placements regardless of length of stay, except in the case of AWOL.

1.160 Previous Placement History (Continued)

01 - Parents or extended family
02 - Receiving home or facility
03 - Foster home
04 - Group home
05 - Open residential
06 - closed care or wilderness program
07 - Detention
08 - Hospital
09 - AWOL (in excess of 1 month)

1.170 Number of Social Workers

One digit refers to the total number of district office social workers who have been directly involved with the child and his family over the past two years, up to the time of admission.

1.175 Number of Months with Social Worker

A two digit code indicates the total number of months the child has had a social worker over the past two years, up to the time of admission.

1.2 FAMILY INFORMATION

1.180 Number of Siblings

Two digits refer to the number of siblings the child has.

Note: "Siblings" is defined as "only those youth sharing the same biological mother". Therefore adoptive or foster children are not included, and in some cases, step-siblings may not be included.

00 - No siblings
01 - One sibling
02 - Two siblings
etc.

Family Structure

Note: For our purposes, "current family group" is defined as "the most recent family group (foster, relative, adoptive or other) the child has lived with for at least two years."

1.200 Family Structure - Mother

In the child's current family group (as defined previously), the mother figure is:

1 - Natural mother
2 - Step mother
3 - C/L mother
4 - Adoptive
5 - Foster
6 - Grandmother, aunt, etc.
7 - none

1.210 Family Structure - Father

In child's current family group, the father figure is:

1 - Natural father
2 - Step father
3 - C/L father
4 - Adoptive
5 - Foster
6 - Grandfather, uncle, etc.
7 - none

1.220 Characteristics at Time of Admission that Restrict Placement with Current Family

Rank up to 3 characteristics in order of most to least prominent that state why the child cannot live at home at this time. If only one characteristic applies, indicate zeros in the last column(s).

1.220 Characteristics at Time of Admission that Restrict Placement with Current Family (Continued)

0 - None
1 - Problem specific to child
2 - Problem specific to parent(s)
3 - Child-Parent Interaction
9 - Other

1.225 Child's Age at Adoption - if applicable

0 - Not adopted
1 - 0 - 5 months
2 - 6 months - 1 year
3 - 1 - 2 years
4 - 3 - 5 years
5 - 6 - 11 years
6 - 12+ years

1.230 Family Source of Income

1 - Full income security
2 - Social Allowance Supplement
3 - Indian Affairs Supplement
4 - Employed Full Time
5 - No income
6 - Other
7 - Casual Employment
9 - Unknown

1.240 Number of Months since Child has lived with Current Family

Indicate: 1 - less than 1 month
2 - 1 - 6 months
3 - 6 - 12 months
4 - 12 - 24 months
5 - more than 24 months

1.250 Number of Siblings ever in C.W. Institutional Care or Adult Correction Settings

0 - 0
1 - 1
2 - 2
3 - 3
4 - 4
5 - 5
6 - 6
7 - 7
8 - 8
9 - Not Known

1.260 Year of Earliest Known Contact of Family with Department (For Child Welfare Protection Services or Equivalent)

Two digits indicate the year of the earliest known contact the family had with Social Services in which the child was involved. This may include areas outside of Alberta, if known.

e.g. A family was investigated for child abuse in Ontario in 1979. Indicate: 1791

Do not include parents application for Social Assistance or other cases where the child was not directly involved.

If unknown, indicate: 1919

1.270 Delinquent History

One digit indicates the frequency, that is the approximate number of times charged with or incarcerated for the following types of offences.

1.270 Delinquent History (Continued)

Crimes against Persons - which include:

- Murder/Manslaughter
- Serious assaunt
- Sexual assault
- Robbery with violence
- Violence-related crimes

Property - which include:

- Robbery
- Break and Enter
- Theft
- Auto Theft
- Possession of Stolen Property
- Property Damage
- Vandalism
- Arson
- Fraud, forgery

Self - which include:

- Possession of Drugs
- Alcohol or Drug Abuse
- Prostitution
- Suicide
- Possession of Dangerous Weapons
- Those crimes in which the child is the victim.

Statute - which include:

- Truancy
- Escaping legal custody (runaway)
- Out of control of family
- Liquor-related offences
- Traffic offences
- Causing disturbances

General Rule - Crimes against statute are those acts that would not be considered criminal if committed by an adult.

1.270 Delinquent History (Continued)

Indicate 0, 1, 2, or 3 which approximates the number of charges in each of the four categories.

0 - No delinquencies
1 - 1 or 2 offences (incidental delinquent history)
2 - 3 to 9 offences (moderate delinquent history)
3 - 10 or more offences (well-established history)

e.g. A child has one charge of armed robbery and 5 charges of break and enter.

Indicate:

	1			2			0			0	
P	Pr.	S.	St.

1.280 Medication at Intake

0 - None
1 - For emotional/behavioural/psychiatric
2 - For medical/physical reasons (epilepsy, eneuresis)
3 - Both

Note: Only consider those medications which are corrective, (e.g. - not birth control).

1.290 Epilepsy

Is the child known to be epileptic?

Indicate: 1 - Yes
2 - No

1.295 Enuresis

Is the child known to be currently enuretic?

Indicate: 1 - Yes
2 - No

1.300 History of Suicide Attempts

Indicate: 1 - Yes
2 - Suspected
3 - No
4 - Not known

1.310 Placement in Last Community School

This refers to the last grade the child was in when last attending school in the community.

00 - Special Class
01 - 1st grade
02 - 2nd grade
03 - 3rd grade
04 - 4th grade
05 - 5th grade
06 - 6th grade
07 - 7th grade
08 - 8th grade
09 - 9th grade
10 - 10th grade or higher
99 - not known

1.320 Attendance of Child in Last 3 months of Community School

Indicate:

1 - Attended regularly
2 - Attended irregularly
3 - Attended almost never
9 - N/A

1.330 In last year of Community School, the child's behaviour was characterized as:

1 - Withdrawn or passive
2 - Cooperative
3 - Disruptive
4 - Extremely disrputive
9 - N/A

1.340 School Board

This refers to the last school the child was attending in the community.

1 - Public
2 - Separate
3 - Other (e.g. Special Ed. School)

1.3 TEST INFORMATION

(LINE 2)

2.010 Agency Number

The first two digits of this 7 digit field refer to the child's present placement from the following list:

01 - Roper Hull
02 - Y.D.C.
03 - Westfield
04 - Y.A.C., Fort McMurray e.g. |0|4| | | | | |
05 - Y.A.C., High Prairie
06 - Y.A.C., Lac La Biche
07 - Y.A.C., Grande Prairie
08 - Y.A.C., Red Deer
09 - Sifton Children's Centre, Lethbridge
10 - Y.A.C., Medicine Hat
11 - Calgary Children's Centre
12 - Enviros
13 - Edmonton Detention Receiving Centre
14 -
15 -
16 -

Agency-assigned child number

The next four digits refer to the agency file number assigned upon the child's first admission to that agency.

e.g. |0|4|0|1|2|8| |

The last digit refers to the total number of admissions of the child to the particular agency.

(e.g., if this is the child's second admission, indicate 2)

|0|4|0|1|2|8|2|

2.040 Line Number

One digit refers to the first line containing the following test information. Indicate "2".

2.050 S.S.C.H. File Number

The first 6 digits refer to the family S.S.C.H. file number.

Sex

Indicate: B - Boy
G - Girl

Child

The last two digits are the unique identifiers of the child within the family.

The entire S.S.C.H. file number may be obtained directly from the skeleton file information slip.

2.080 Date of Jesness

Indicate the year and month the Jesness Inventory was last administered.

2.090 to 2.190 Jesness Inventory Scores

List the T or standard scores for each category (leave blank if untested).

2.200 Date of WISC-R

Indicate the year and month the WISC-R was last administered.

2.210 to 2.320 WISC-R Scores

Indicate the most recent scaled scores for each subtest. (Leave blank if no test results are available)

2.330 to 2.350 — IQ Scores

Indicate Verbal I.Q.
Performance I.Q.
Full-scale I.Q.

2.360 — Date of Grade Evaluation

4 digits indicate the year and month the child was administered the following academic tests for grade level.

2.370 to 2.390 — Grade Levels

Three digits refer to grade levels (not standard scores) in math, reading and spelling, as indicated by educational test scores (e.g., WRAT) administered by the agency's teaching staff.

The last digit is always a decimal.

e.g., (1) if test score is 4.9, indicate 4 9
(2) if test score is 10.0, indicate 10 0

If test scores were administered more than once, indicate the most recent scores.

If tests were not administered, leave blank.

2. DISCHARGE/TRANSFER FORM

(LINE 3)

The following information should be filled out when a child is discharged from an institution or transferred to another institution or program.

3.010 Agency Number

The agency-assigned child number is a 7-digit number that will be unique to the individual being identified.

The first 2 digits indicate the agency the child is being discharged from.

01 - Roper Hull
02 - Y.D.C.
03 - Westfield
04 - Y.A.C., Fort McMurray
05 - Y.A.C., High Prairie
06 - Y.A.C., Lac La Biche
07 - Y.A.C., Grande Prairie
08 - Y.A.C., Red Deer
09 - Sifton Children's Centre, Lethbridge
10 - Y.A.C., Medicine Hat
11 - Calgary Children's Centre
12 - Enviros
13 - Edmonton Detention Receiving Centre
14 -
15 -
16 -

Agency-assigned Child Number

The next 4 digits refer to the agency-assigned file number of the child's first admission. If not applicable, indicate zeros.

The last digit refers to the total number of admissions of the child to the particular agency.

3.040 Line Number

Digit 8 refers to line 3 which contains the discharge information.

Indicate "3".

3.050 SSCH File Number

6 digits indicate the family SSCH file number.

Sex

Indicate B - Boy
G - Girl

Child

The last two digits are the unique identifiers of the child within the family available from the skeleton file information slip.

3.080 Date of Discharge

6 digits indicate the date of discharge or transfer from the institution in the following sequence: year, month, day.

3.085 Charges While in Care Did the child have any charges while in care?

Indicate: 0 - No
1 - Yes

in the first column.

If yes, indicate 0 - No
1 - Yes

for each category: Charges against Persons, Property, Self and Statute.

Do not indicate frequencies.

Number of Days in Each Type of Care

Indicate the number of days the child spent in each type of care while at your agency.

3.090 Days on Detention/Remand

3.100 Days on Compulsory Care Order

3.110 Days on Compulsory Care Certificate

3.120 Days in Open-residential

3.130 Days in Non-residential (Day Program)

e.g., if a child spent 2 weeks on a remand status, then received a 60 day c.c.o., indicate:

ı0ı1ı4ı	ı0ı6ı0ı	ı0ı0ı0ı	ı0ı0ı0ı	ı0ı0ı0ı
Det./Rem.	CCO	CCC	Open Res.	Non-Res.

3.140 Medication at Discharge

Indicate:

0 - None
1 - For emotional/behavioural/psychiatric reasons
2 - For medical/physical reasons (epilepsy, enuresis)
3 - Both

3.150 Characteristics at Discharge that Restrict Placement with the Current Family

Rank up to 3 characteristics in order of most to least prominent that state why the child should not return home. If only one characteristic applies, indicate zeros in the last column(s)

0 - None
1 - Problem specific to child
2 - Problem specific to parent(s)
3 - Child/Parent Interaction
9 - Other

3.160 Overall Adaptation of Child to Agency Setting

Indicate the most appropriate description of the child's behaviour or response to the program while in care.

1 - Consistently negative
2 - Usually negative
3 - Varies between negative and fair
4 - Usually fair
5 - Varies between fair and positive
6 - Usually positive
7 - Consistently positive

3.170 Improvement of Child

One digit describes the child's improvement or lack of improvement in relation to treatment goals established by the agency.

1 - Marked improvement
2 - Some improvement
3 - No change
4 - Regression
5 - Not applicable

3.180 Number of Runs

One digit indicates the number of times the child has run or been AWOL from the institution.

(Do not include suspected or attempted AWOLs)

0 - None
1 - 1
2 - 2
3 - 3
4 - 4
5 - 5
6 - 6
7 - 7
8 - 8
9 - 9+

3.190 Number of Locked Confinements

One digit refers to the number of times the child was placed in locked confinement from admission to discharge (i.e. a single, locked room).

0 - None
1 - 1
2 - 2
3 - 3
4 - 4
5 - 5
6 - 6
7 - 7
8 - 8
9 - 9+

3.200 Discharge Placement

2 digits refer to the child's actual placement at discharge.

01 - Own home or extended family
02 - Receiving facility
03 - Foster home
04 - Group home
05 - Open residential
06 - closed care or wilderness program
07 - Detention
08 - Hospital
09 - Independent living
10 - AWOL (if AWOL for at least 2 weeks)

Note: If the child has been AWOL for less than 2 weeks, indicate the placement he is AWOL from.

3.210 Supervision Needs at Discharge

2 digits indicate the agency's first choice of placements, despite the actual placement.

01 - Own home/extended family
02 - Receiving facility
03 - Foster home
04 - Group home
05 - Open residential
06 - Wilderness
07 - Closed care
08 - Detention
09 - Hospital
10 - Independent living

3.220 Academic/Vocational Needs Recommended by the Agency at Discharge

1 - Regular School System
2 - Vocational class
3 - Special Ed class
4 - Work program
5 - Employed (not through school)
6 - Residential Care (if transferred to another institution)

3.230 Special Needs or Recommendations Made by the Agency at Discharge

One digit indicates first choice.

0 - None
1 - Follow up worker
2 - Family therapy
3 - Group counselling
4 - Individual psychotherapy
5 - Special community program
6 - Life skills program
7 - Alcohol/drug treatment program
8 - Other

Enter "special needs" on 3 month follow-up form.

3. FOLLOW-UP FORM

Note: Follow-up forms are completed at 3 months, 6 months, 1 year and two years. This information will be directly available from the Child Welfare Information System, and follow-up on "special needs" at 3 months, by contacting the social worker.

4.010 Agency Number
5.
6.
7.

The first 2 digits indicate the agency from the following list:

01 - Roper Hull
02 - Y.D.C.
03 - Westfield
04 - Y.A.C.,Fort McMurray
05 - Y.A.C.,High Prairie
06 - Y.A.C.,Lac La Biche
07 - Y.A.C.,Grande Prairie
08 - Y.A.C.,Red Deer
09 - Sifton Children's Centre, Lethbridge
10 - Y.A.C., Medicine Hat
11 - Calgary Children's Centre
12 - Enviros
13 - Edmonton Detention Receiving Centre
14 -
15 -
16 -

Agency-assigned child number

The next 4 digits refer to the agency file number assigned upon the child's first admission to that agency.

If not applicable, indicate zeros.

Digit 7 refers to the total number of admissions of the child to the particular agency.

.040 Line Number

Indicate: 4 - 3 month follow-up
5 - 6 month follow-up
6 - 1 year follow-up
7 - 2 year follow-up

.050 S.S.C.H. File Number

The first 6 digits refer to the family S.S.C.H. File Number.

Sex

Indicate: B - Boy
G - Girl

Child

The last two digits are the unique identifiers of the child within the family.

.080 Date of Follow-up

6 digits indicate the year, month and day of the follow-up.

.085 Follow-up Case Status

1 digit identifies the status of the case at the time of follow-up.

0 - Case open
1 - Child deceased
2 - Child over age
3 - Legal adoption
4 - Whereabouts of family unknown
5 - Service no longer required
6 - Required service provided elsewhere
7 - No action required
8 - Adjournment Sine Die (JDA)
9 - Termination of Order or Agreement

.090 Residence

One digit refers to where the child is living at follow-up.

0 - No information (case closed)
1 - Own home/extended family
2 - Receiving facility
3 - Foster home
4 - Group home
5 - Open residential
6 - Closed care or wilderness program
7 - Detention
8 - Hospital
9 - Independent living
10 - AWOL (if AWOL for at least 2 weeks)
11 - Jail

Note: If the child has been AWOL for less than 2 weeks, indicate the placement he is AWOL from.

.110 Follow-up Charges

This field identifies the type and frequency of charges the child has had since discharge (3 month follow-up) or since the date of the last follow-up.

One digit indicates frequency (that is, the approximate number of times charged) under each category: Persons, Property, Self, Statute.

0 - No charges
1 - 1 - 2 offences
2 - 3 - 9 offences
3 - 10 or more offences.

.120 Follow-up: Academic/Vocational

Indicate the type of work or school program the child is currently attending.

1 - Regular school system
2 - Vocational class or program
3 - Special Ed
4 - Work program
5 - Employed (not through school)
6 - Unemployed, not attending
7 - Residential care
8 - Other
9 - Not known

.130 3-Month Follow-Up Only

Identified Special Needs for Child

This field identifies whether or not the child is following the recommendations the agency made at discharge.

The first digit refers to what the child's special needs were at discharge.

0 - None
1 - Follow-up Worker
2 - Family Therapy
3 - Group Counselling
4 - Individual Psychotherapy
5 - Special Community Program
6 - Life Skills Program
7 - Alcohol/drug Treatment Program
8 - Other

The second digit indicates if these needs are being (or have been) met at the 3 month follow-up.

Indicate: 0 - No
1 - Yes

APPENDIX "A"

INTERNAL PROGRAM

AGENCY _____

This 3-digit code identifies any treatment-oriented program developed by the individual agency. Therefore, each agency will have their own code and coding system.

This field could also be developed for the agency's own use or special interests.

If not yet applicable, indicate zeros in these columns.

APPENDIX "B"

DISTRICT OFFICES BY REGION

Northwest Region

02 - Barrhead
17 - Grande Prairie
19 - High Level
20 - High Prairie
25 - Peace River
28 - Slave Lake
36 - Whitecourt

Northeast Region

01 - Athabasca
04 - Bonnyville
15 - Ft. McMurray
64 - Grande Centre
21 - Lac La Biche
48 - Lloydminster
29 - Smokey Lake
31 - St. Paul
32 - Vegreville
33 - Vermilion
60 - Westlock

Edmonton Region

62 - Edmonton Millwoods
10 - Edmonton North
43 - Edmonton Hys. Centre
42 - Edmonton Capilano Centre
11 - Edmonton Southwest
13 - Edmonton Westmount
12 - Edmonton Centennial Mall
55 - Edmonton Northeast
14 - Edson
44 - Parkland
- Drayton Valley
46 - Leduc
16 - Grande Cache
40 - St. Albert
38 - Sherwood Park
57 - Hinton

Central Region

08 - Camrose
09 - Drumheller
18 - Hanna
24 - Olds
26 - Red Deer
27 - Rocky Mountain House
30 - Stettler
34 - Wainwright
35 - Wetaskiwin

Calgary Region

63 - Airdrie
39 - Calgary Clayburn Centre
06 - Calgary Symons Valley
41 - Calgary Foothills
07 - Calgary Willow Park
37 - Calgary Alberta Place
49 - Calgary Ranchills
- Calgary North
47 - Canmore
- Calgary Glenmore
59 - Strathmore
- Okotoks

South Region

05 - Brooks
61 - Claresholm
03 - Crowsnest
22 - Lethbridge
23 - Medicine Hat
58 - Taber

54 - Edmonton Court Services
53 - Calgary Court Services
45 - Calgary Crisis
46 - Edmonton Crisis
50 - City of Edmonton
51 - City of Calgary
52 - Central Office

APPENDIX "C"

DATA FORMS

Institutional Information System
Data Input Form-Intake
Line 1

Agency No. 1.010 | Line No. | SSCH File No. 1.050 | Sex | Child No. | Date of Birth Yr. Mo. Day 1.080 | Date of Admission Yr. Mo. Day 1.085 | Internal Prog. 1.190

Race 1.095 | Status 1.100 | Add. Status | Service | D.O. 1.130 | Referral Reason | Tot. Placements 1.145 | Most recent prior pl. 1.150

Placement History 1.160 | No. of S.W. | No. of Months with S.W. 1.175 | Siblings 1.180 | Family (M) | Family (F) | Char. Curr. Fam. 1.220 | Age at Adopt. | Income

Months since Curr. Fam. 1.240 | Sibs. in Care | Earliest Contact Yr. | Delinquent History P Pr. S St. 1.270 | Medication | Epilepsy | Enuresis

Suicide 1.300 | Last School Pl. | Attendance | Behaviour | School Board 1.340

FINE PRINT

TEST DATA - LINE 2

Agency No. 2.110 | Line No. | SSCH File No. 3.050 | Sex | Child No. | Date of Jesness In. Yr. Mo. Day 2.080

Jesness Scores

SM 2.090 | VO | IMM | AUT | AL | MA | WTH | SA | REP | DEN | A.I.

Date of Wisc-R Yr. Mo. 2.200 | Wisc-R Info. 2.210 | Scores Sim. | Arith. | Voc. | Comp. | D.S. | P.C. | P.A. | B.D. | B.A. | COB | MAZ

V.I.Q. 2.330 | P.I.Q. | Full-Scale I.Q. | Date of Grade Evaluation Yr. Mo. 2.360 | Math. | Reading | Spelling 2.390

FINE PRINT

DISCHARGE FORM - LINE 3

3.010

Agency No. ⌊⌋⌊⌋⌊⌋⌊⌋⌊⌋⌊⌋

Line No. ⌊⌋

SSCH File No. ⌊⌋⌊⌋⌊⌋⌊⌋⌊⌋

Sex ⌊⌋

Child ⌊⌋

Date of Discharge Yr. Mo. Day ⌊⌋⌊⌋⌊⌋⌊⌋⌊⌋⌊⌋

Charges in Care P ⌊⌋ Pr. ⌊⌋ S. ⌊⌋ ST. ⌊⌋

Days in Detention/Remand ⌊⌋⌊⌋⌊⌋

Days on CCO ⌊⌋⌊⌋⌊⌋

Days on CCC ⌊⌋⌊⌋⌊⌋

Days in Open Res. ⌊⌋⌊⌋⌊⌋

Days in Non-Res. ⌊⌋⌊⌋⌊⌋

Medication ⌊⌋

Family Char. ⌊⌋⌊⌋⌊⌋

Adaptation ⌊⌋

Improvement ⌊⌋

No. of Runs ⌊⌋⌊⌋⌊⌋

No. locked continements ⌊⌋⌊⌋⌊⌋

Placement ⌊⌋⌊⌋⌊⌋

Sup. Needs ⌊⌋⌊⌋⌊⌋

Ac/Voc. Needs ⌊⌋

Sp. Needs ⌊⌋

enter special needs on 3 month follow-up form.

FINE PRINT

FOLLOW-UP FORM

Indicate: 3 mo _____ line 4
6 mo _____ line 5
1 yr _____ line 6
2 yr _____ line 7

Special Needs at Discharge: _____

Agency No. 4.110 | Line No. | SSCH File No. 4.030 | Sex | Child | Date of Follow-Up Yr. Mo. Day 4.080 | Case Closure

Residence | Charges P | Pr. | S. | ST. | Ac/Voc. | Needs met (3 month follow-up only)

FINE PRINT

GLOSSARY

Additional Status - Any additional departmental status assigned after primary status was established (e.g., Temporary ward on probation).

Agency - The institution a child has been placed in. This may include the agencies' group homes.

Agency-assigned child number - This number will identify any individual child in the system. It consists of 1) the code identifying the agency, 2) the file number the agency assigns to the child upon admission and 3) the number of admissions of that child to the agency.

AWOL - If reporting AWOL in "previous placement history", include it as a placement only if the child has been AWOL for at least one month. "AWOL" in the discharge and follow-up forms, however, refers to AWOL for at least 2 weeks.

Child Welfare Act (CWA) - Wardship may be obtained under this Act for reasons other than delinquencies (e.g., neglect) for children in care.

Child Welfare Information System - A tracking system which provides certain information on individual children in all programs.

Code - The numerical code referring to specific information (e.g., a 2-digit code indicates "reason for referral").

Column - The space containing the smallest amount of information in the form of a digit. (There are 79 digits or columns on the intake sheet).

Cross-tabulations - The analysis of one variable against another (e.g., - the greater the age, the greater the grade placement).

Current Family - The most recent family group (foster, relative, adoptive or other) the child lived with for at least two years.

Date - Date is always recorded as year, month, day. When four columns are allotted, indicate year, then month.

Digit - Any number from 0 to 9.

District Office - The Social Services district office that has the client file at the time of admission. It is also used to indicate the geographical location of the family.

Discharge - Refers to discharge to the community.

Discharge Data Form - The form compiled upon discharge from the institution. This contains information on the child while in your care.

Extended Family - Any relative excluding the parents.

Family Support - A Social Services status which relates to the provision of services to support a family.

Field - A set of one or more columns or digits that records a single piece of information (e.g., date of birth is a 6-digit field).

Follow-up Forms - Data forms that record what happens to youth after leaving the institution.

Frequency - A number count; how often something occurs.

Grade level - The child's grade levels in reading, math and spelling, as determined by the agency's educational staff.

Jesness Inventory - A questionnaire type of test found useful in detecting psychological problems of children.

Jeuvenile Delinquent Act (J.D.A.) - Wardship may be obtained under this Act if the child has been involved in delinquent behaviour. It cannot apply to children under 12.

Intake Data Form - The form containing background information of the child.

Line - The contents of up to 123 columns of information.

Locked Confinements - Refer to any occasion a child is placed in a locked room for any period of time.

Medication - Refers to corrective medication only. Do not include contraceptive methods or devices.

Nine (9) - Wherever possible, the digit 9 generally refers to "not known".

Permanent Ward (P.W.) - A status where the child's guardian is the Director of Child Welfare until age 18.

Placement - Refers to any time a child is "placed" through social services involvement for any length of time.

Primary Status - The child's original departmental status.

Reports - Computer-generated summaries or analyses of data which may then be translated into written reports.

Runs - Actual AWOLS while the child is institutionalized (i.e., not suspected or attempted).

Siblings - For our purposes, "only those youth sharing the same biological mother".

Status - See Additonal or Primary Status.

Statute Offences - Crimes against statute are those acts that would not be considered criminal if committed by an adult (e.g., truancy, out of parental control).

Standard Score - A calculated score usually from 0 to 100 which is based on population norms and has uniform methods and interpretations for everyone.

S.S.C.H. File Number - A 9-digit file number assigned by Central Records for each child entered upon the Child Welfare Information System.

Social Worker - Any departmental social worker who has ever been directly involved with the child and his family.

Special Needs - Refers to follow-up recommendations as determined by the agency.

Supervision Needs - Refer to the child's needs at discharge with respect to placement, as determined by the agency.

Temporary Ward (T.W.) - A status where the child's guardian is the Director of Child Welfare for a temporary period of time.

Transfer - Refers to transfer to another institution or program.

WRAT - Wide Range Achievement Test - An academic test to determine grade levels.

WISC - R - Wechsler Intelligence Scale for Children - Revised.

Zero - In most cases, the digit "0" refers to "none" or "no answer".

APPENDIX E

Pages 151 - 154 are not included here, due to lack of authorization from the publisher of the Jesness Inventory. This information can be obtained from Consulting Psychologists Press, 577 College Avenue, Palo Alto, California.

1. Social Maladjustment (63 items) Social Maladjustment refers to a set of attitudes associated with unfulfilled needs, as defined by the extent to which an individual shares the attitudes of persons who demonstrate inability to meet, in socially approved ways, the demands of their environment.

2. Value Orientation (39 items) Value Orientation refers to a tendency to hold values characteristic of persons in the lower social classes.

3. Immaturity (45 items) By Immaturity is meant the tendency to display attitudes and perceptions of self and others which are usual for persons of a younger age.

4. Autism (28 items) Autism refers to a tendency in thinking and perceiving to distort reality according to one's personal desires or needs.

5. Alienation (26 items) Alienation refers to the presence of distrust and estrangement in a person's attitudes toward others, especially toward persons representing authority.

6. Manifest Aggression (31 items) Manifest Aggression refers to an awareness of unpleasant feelings, especially of anger and frustration, a tendency to react readily with emotion, and perceived discomfort concerning the presence and control of these feelings.

7. Withdrawal (24 items) Withdrawal involves a perceived lack of satisfaction with self and others and a tendency toward passive escape or isolation from others.

8. Social Anxiety (24 items) Social Anxiety is defined as the perceived emotional discomfort associated with interpersonal relationships.

9. Repression (15 items) Repression refers to the exclusion from conscious awareness of feelings and emotions which the individual normally would be expected to experience, or his failure to label these emotions.

10. Denial (20 items) The term Denial refers to the failure to acknowledge unpleasant events or aspects of reality normally encountered in daily living.

11. Asocialization Asocialization refers to a generalized disposition to resolve problems in social and personal adjustment in ways ordinarily regarded as showing a disregard for social customs or rules.